April, 1939 Vol. XVI. No. 2

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

PAGE

CAN WE TEACH THE ETHICS OF JESUS? Gordon Poteat 81

THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. Oscar Fisher Blackwelder 97

ON BEING REALISTIC IN RELIGION. Henry B. Robins 106

THE QUEST FOR CHRISTIAN STRATEGY. Ralph Waldo Nelson 117

THE MADRAS CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL. Kenneth Scott Latourette 126

YOUTH AND THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY. John Scott Everton 132

BOOK REVIEWS 141

BOOK NOTICES 157

BOOKS RECEIVED 159

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is published by the Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary, with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees. THE QUARTERLY aims to be a journal for the expression of theological opinion, embracing all the interests of students of religion, whether ministers, teachers, or laymen. It does not accept responsibility for the views expressed, publication indicating that the editors regard the articles as voicing opinions important enough to command attention.

R. E. E. HARKNESS, Editor.
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager.

Editorial communications, contributions and books for review should be sent to

THE EDITOR, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Remittances and business communications should be addressed to

THE BUSINESS MANAGER, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Requests for catalogs and communications regarding courses in the Seminary should be addressed to

PRESIDENT JAMES H. FRANKLIN
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Subscription, $1.50 the year; single numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pa.

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, April, 1939, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XVI APRIL, 1939 No. 2

CAN WE TEACH THE ETHICS OF JESUS?

GORDON POTEAT
Crozer Theological Seminary

DEAN INGE, in his *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems,* asks the question: "Can the enlightened conscience of the twentieth century still look back to the gospel of the first century for authoritative guidance . . ?" Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, who wrote a book called *The Twilight of Christianity,* replies: "Why go back two thousand years to a Palestinian peasant for guidance in our problems today? . . He (Jesus) was an uneducated man who lived a very simple and restricted life in a backward and provincial economy . . . hence he was totally unfamiliar with modern social and economic conditions and with the natural and social science of today. Therefore he was in no sense prepared to give out competent opinions to guide mankind in the twentieth century."

Of course, there has been no period in the Christian era when persons outside the Christian Church did not dismiss Jesus as irrelevant to their practical concerns. But today, *within* the Christian Church, there are those who agree in substance, if not in form of statement, with outside critics as to the ethical irrelevance of Jesus. It is asserted that the teachings of Jesus, his ethical injunctions, were postulated upon the expectation of the immediate end of the world, the cessation of terrestrial time and space. But this expectation was manifestly mistaken. The collapse of the fundamental ground of the ethical injunctions of Jesus makes his teaching irrelevant today. A literal application of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, it is said, would mean the end of all social order. There are church scholars who go further than this. They contend that there is no assured knowledge of either the character or the teachings of Jesus. We have in the Gospels the confused and conflicting reports, not of eye-witnesses of the deeds or hearers of the words of Jesus, but materials reflecting the preaching of men removed by at least fifty years from the time of Jesus—preachers who were not much concerned to preserve the records of the deeds and words of Jesus, but rather intent on meeting the situations of the churches of their own time.

They so manipulated the traditions to suit their own purposes that the historical residue is almost negligible. They used "Jesus" to support their own contentions rather than attempt to conform their practices to him. Rudolph Bultmann, one of the leading figures in this school of thought, writes: "One can only emphasize the uncertainty of our knowledge of the person and work of the historical Jesus and likewise of the origin of Christianity." (*Form Criticism,* p. 20.) And Dr. Martin Dibelius, in his book *From Tradition to Gospel,* (p. 9), writes: "The company of unlettered people who expected the end of the world any day had neither the capacity nor the inclination for the production of books and we must not predicate a true literary activity in the Christian church of the first two or three decades. The materials which have been handed down to us in these decades lived in these decades an unliterary life or *had indeed as yet no life at all.*" (Italics mine.) Dr. Henry Cadbury makes a legitimate protest in his recent volume against "The Peril of Modernizing Jesus," but he concludes that the reverse process, that of "demodernizing" Jesus, "leaves us an historical figure and an historical scene vague and incomplete in outline, jejune in interest, *alien and irrelevant to the great issues of modern life.*" (p. 190—italics mine.) In other words, these Christian scholars seem to agree with the non-Christian critics that we really know very little about Jesus and that what we know is of no great significance for the moral guidance of modern men.

If these opinions which we have quoted are ultimately accepted as the inevitable conclusions of honest research it is hard to see how the rejection of Jesus as the source and inspiration of our ethical insights and judgments can be avoided. A rigorous and consistent thinker will not try to save the case by sentimental references to a Jesus whose delineaments can no longer be discerned. It is of small significance to maintain that a person by the name of Jesus once lived in Galilee if we can have no inkling of what manner of man he was: to all intents he had just as well never have lived at all. Nor is there any escape by way of the Christ of faith. The Christ of Christian faith has always been *Jesus* Christ, an historical person of definite quality and character. If Jesus can no longer be found, "Christ" will vanish before long. Eventually the conclusions of the scholars will be disseminated among the ordinary members of the Christian churches and practical men will lose their interest in the tenuous relict of the scholars' research. Certain general principles, at one time associated with his name and person may survive, but their significance will in no way depend upon their connection with him. One may expect that there will always exist a little coterie of scholars who will continue to pursue an antiquarian interest in the receding

figure of Jesus, writing monographs on obscure and erudite matters for the archives of university libraries. But the man in the street will take Barnes' advice and turn to his contemporaries for guidance in his moral problems.

But are these critical conclusions inevitable? Is it true that we can know practically nothing about the historical Jesus? Because his milieu differed from our own has Jesus no ethical significance for us today? Is the fundamental basis of his teaching an illusion about the end of the world? It is possible, at least, that a facing of the facts, as rigorous and as honest as true science demands, may allow for other conclusions than those referred to above. We need to distinguish between facts and the inferences which are drawn from those facts. The inferences may not be necessitous, but idiosyncratic. Dr. Campbell Moody, in the Bruce Lectures (1929), quotes Wrede's remark about the critical handling of Jesus' announcement of his impending sufferings: "Each modern investigator selects from these announcements whatsoever words fit his own construction of the facts and his own conception of what is historically possible, while he rejects the remainder." And Doctor Moody suggests that this method of handling the records is fairly typical of much critical study. Sometimes a particular verse or passage is selected as the key to the understanding of the Gospels as a whole and then all material which does not fit into this reading of the records is eliminated as unhistorical, as interpolation or conflation. That this method is not infallible is indicated by the disagreements among scholars as to which element is historically the key. Schweitzer takes Matthew 10:23 as the key passage and interprets the life of Jesus from a radical apocalyptic point of view. Wellhausen considered the non-apocalyptic ethical sayings to be "the genuine historical nucleus." Using the same critical methodology the critics often come out at opposite poles. It is not difficult to demonstrate how highly subjective a good deal of this textual reconstruction is. Chiliasts have been rightly criticized for building their theology on a single verse in The Revelation (Rev. 20:7). But do not many critics practice the same deductive art? We have the strange spectacle of premillennialist and critic lying in the same bed, though they do not speak to each other. Biblical critics are human beings and are affected by urges and ambitions common to other men. This needs to be taken into account in appraising their work. There is the "chess-player" type who handles the records as if moving chessmen in a game with opposing critics, interested in the intellectual exercise of the game. There is upon others the urge to construct some "original" theory and gain distinction thereby. H. G. Wells, in *The Wonderful Visit,* tells of an English parson who shot

an angel in the course of his effort to get his name in the encyclopedia. There are those who are moved by a desire to classify in neat and systematic order under fixed rules and categories all the varied phenomena of life. One may observe this sort of mind at work in the book of Dibelius referred to above. The materials of the Gospels are all methodically arranged in precise order: sermons, paradigms, tales, legends. If any material does not quite fit a special class it is whittled and pared until it finally fits into its appointed niche. When this sort of mind goes to work on human nature, by the time classification is achieved all originality and individuality have disappeared. The parts are all pigeonholed, but cut off from the living whole they are dead. These observations are not intended to discredit modern methods of biblical research, but to suggest that their results depend not alone upon the methods used, but also upon the users of the methods.

In regard to historicity, it is the contention of this paper that the situation as to the possibility of knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus is not nearly so desperate as some critics would have us believe; that while there is a great deal which we do not know about Jesus and which we might like to know, we do have *historical* knowledge about him ample enough to make it possible for us today honestly to present to men the moral and spiritual challenge of his life and teachings, the challenge which has hitherto been the most distinctive element in the Christian message and the prime reason for its power in human history. Christianity and the Church were not born of abstract principles nor has their influence in the world been the result of the proclamation of such principles. The author of the Fourth Gospel recognized that the source of power was in "the Word made flesh." In his *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire,* Dr. T. R. Glover says: "As its opponents were quick to point out—and they still find a curious pleasure in rediscovering it—there was little new in Christian teaching. Men had been monotheists before, they had worshiped, they had loved their neighbors, they had displayed the virtues of Christians—what was there peculiar in Christianity? Plato, says Celsus, had taught long ago everything of the least value in the Christian scheme of things. The Talmud, according to the modern Jew, contains a parallel to everything that Jesus said. . . What was new in the new religion? . . The Christians had their answer ready. In clear speech and aphasia, they indicated their founder. He was new" (p. 116). Can it be denied that the moral power which the gospels have exercised in the lives of countless men and women has been due to the impact of the central figure which they portray? This influence has been morally creative beyond compare precisely because men have

been convinced of the surpassing reality of the moral and religious life of Jesus as it is presented in the Gospels. Have they been mistaken as to that historical reality? Was Jesus, after all, only a typical Jew or just another in the long line of Hebrew teachers of righteousness who has been built up by literary skill and mythopoesis into the heroic figure whose overwhelming force of character has moved men to devotion all down these ages? If honesty compels us to admit that historically the Jesus of the Gospels is fundamentally unreal, we must admit it. We cannot save our souls by shutting our eyes. But as already suggested, we are convinced that an honest facing of all the facts unearthed by research not only does not make that conclusion inevitable, but rather reinforces the age-long conviction that the portrait of Jesus which we find in the New Testament is substantially and realistically what Jesus was.

What manner of man was Jesus and what did he teach? Is this question unanswerable? In our search for an answer we shall begin, not with the Gospels, but with the writings of the Apostle Paul. There is a wide difference of opinion as to the dating of the Gospels, all the way from 50 to after 100 A. D. And this dating determines to some extent the credibility which different critics allow the writings. But it is generally agreed that the recognized corpus of the letters of the Apostle Paul antedate the Gospels. Moreover, while the authorship of the Gospels is uncertain, there is no disposition to deny that at least seven or eight of the letters attributed to Paul are genuine autographs. In the New Testament we stand upon the firm ground of history, very early Christian history, when, for example, we meet Paul in Galatians or 1 Corinthians. We are not appealing to Paul simply as a witness that Jesus actually lived. As for that, it has been well said that "Paul's testimony is such that before it could be possible to say 'there was no Christ' it would be necessary to say 'there was no Paul,' " (Merezhkovsky—*Jesus, the Unknown,* p. 39). Rather we are seeking information as to the character and teaching of Jesus if these may be found in Paul.

It has become an accepted dictum with some that Paul not only never had any personal contact with Jesus "in the days of his flesh" (which is most likely), but that he had no interest in Jesus of Nazareth, that his sole interest was in the Christ of faith. Second Corinthians 5:16 is a "proof text" for this view. "Yea though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." Here we have an example of that quite unscientific method of deducing a theory from a text. Even the single text, on the face of it, does not support the theory. The declaration is introduced by the statement:

"Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh." A little further on the apostle indicates that he expects to visit the Corinthians in person. Does he anticipate that by that time they will all be disembodied spirits? Moffatt's translation probably suggests the true meaning. "I estimate no one by what is external; even though I once estimated Christ by what is external, I no longer estimate him thus." In this connection we need to be reminded that we possess only a fragmentary collection of the apostle's correspondence and in the collection no letter of his directed to non-believers. Whether he ever wrote such letters we cannot know, but there can be no uncertainty as to the fact that he preached to non-believers. In his letters to Christians he could take many things for granted as to their knowledge of Jesus who had already had "Jesus Christ, the crucified, placarded before their very eyes" (Gal. 3:1). But in preaching to pagans could he have avoided frequent reference to the Jesus of history? It is impossible to believe that he used in his preaching none of the material such as is found in the Gospels, material which the Form-Geschichte school of critics declares comes primarily from early Christian preaching. From an experience as a missionary in preaching to Chinese who have no knowledge of the Christian tradition I can testify to the impossibility of persuading such persons to become disciples apart from a presentation of Jesus as he walked among men. Even if in the preaching of missionaries the "heavenly Saviour" is the message emphasized, it is always a Saviour who came down to live as a man among men, living a life of definite historical quality and character. And the power and conviction which persuades to belief has always been based upon the assumption of the essential truth of the history.

But there need be no speculation when we turn to the letters themselves, for we find therein many references to the historical character of Jesus as well as constant reflections of his teachings. It has been remarked that from these Pauline references "one could write a short life of Jesus." In Galatians 1:18, 19 a visit to Jerusalem is recorded when Paul spent two weeks in fellowship with intimate associates of Jesus. Other contacts are recorded in the second chapter. That Paul could stay with these intimates of the Master and be utterly incurious as to what they could tell him about his life and words is so contrary to human nature that only those who live in books instead of among men could believe it. The autobiographical statements in Paul's letters which reveal his own character to us so plainly, reflect the influence upon his life of what he learned about Jesus and his words. Prior to his conversion he undoubtedly learned much about Jesus from the disciples

with whom he argued and whom he persecuted. Did that learning stop with his conversion? In his book, *The Mind of Christ in Paul,* which is definitive in the discussion of this point and not to be ignored by any who essay to deal with this subject, Dr. F. C. Porter writes: "The reality of the earthly Jesus is taken for granted throughout. The letters of Paul and Paul himself are both completely inexplicable apart from the historical Jesus" (p. 18). Reference to this book obviates any necessity of covering the ground in this paper which is so fully covered by Doctor Porter. It suffices to call to mind such references to the Jesus of history as in Rom. 1:3—his birth; 2 Cor. 8:9—his poverty; 2 Cor. 10:1—his meekness and gentleness; Rom. 15:3—his self-giving service; Col. 3:13—his forgiveness; 1 Cor. 11:23f.—his betrayal, his last supper with his disciples; Gal. 3:1—his crucifixion; 1 Cor. 15:1-8—his resurrection. Paul calls the scars of persecution in his own body "the marks of the Lord Jesus," and speaks of making up to the full the sufferings of Christ. Do these statements sound as if they referred to a mystical ghost or to a flesh-and-blood person? *All these impressions of Jesus which we gather from Paul's letters correspond to the presentation of Jesus in the Gospels.* And we know that Paul's contact with eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus goes back to within three years, at least, of his conversion (Gal. 1:18) and that his conversion occurred within three to five years of the crucifixion of Jesus, perhaps less.

As regards the teachings of Jesus, though few direct quotations of the words of Jesus are given, the essence of what Jesus taught as recorded in the Gospels is found in Paul's letters. Doctor Porter remarks that "Paul is not a legalist even in his attitude toward the words of Jesus" (p. 21). Since Jesus probably taught in Aramaic and the Gospels are in Greek, we do not have his *ipsissima verba* in either Paul or the Gospels, but the congruity of the Pauline and Gospel representations of the spirit and purpose of the teachings of Jesus is strong evidence of their historical genuineness. As Paul declared: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." To catch the spirit of the teachings of Jesus is of far greater importance than to give precise quotations of his actual words. Compare, for example, the twelfth chapter of Romans and recorded sayings of Jesus in the Gospels: Mark 1:15—"repent (change your minds) and believe in the gospel"; Rom. 12:2—"be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind so as to know what the will of God is"; Matt. 6:1, 2—"When thou doest alms . . . be not as the hypocrites"; Rom. 12:9—"Let love be without hypocrisy"; Mark 12:38, 39—"Beware of the scribes who . . . desire the chief seats; Rom. 12:10—"In honor preferring one another"; Matt. 5:44—"Pray for them that perse-

cute you"; Rom. 12:14—"Bless them that persecute you." Many other examples might be cited, but it is not necessary to detail further correspondences here. It is quite as important to notice that the apostle's approach to the good life, or, to use his own word, "righteousness," is essentially that of Jesus as contrasted with that of the Pharisees, though before his conversion he was a strict Pharisee. In *Christianity According to St. Paul,* Dr. C. Anderson Scott writes: "The opposition between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees is . . . a fundamental difference of principle. It is the opposition of two conceptions of virtue. For Jesus, good living is the spontaneous activity of a transformed character; for the scribes and the Pharisees it is obedience to a discipline imposed from without. . . If the ideal of Jesus prevailed, it meant, not a reform of the law, but the substitution of something else for it. . . The scribes and Pharisees perceived, as Paul did later, that Christ would be the end of the Law" (p. 197). Doctor Scott is working from Jesus to Paul, while we are working from Paul to Jesus, but the point he makes is appropriate to our argument that, in the *accepted historical material* in Paul's letters we have a conception of the teaching of Jesus which confirms that which we find in the later Gospels.[1]

As for the Gospels themselves, is it necessary to accept Bultmann's conclusion that the result of the scientific study of the records "is primarily negative and we conclude that the whole framework of the history of Jesus must be viewed as an editorial construction and that therewith a whole series of typical scenes, which because of their ecclesiastical use and their poetic and artistic associations we had looked upon as scenes in the life of Jesus, must be viewed as creations of the evangelists"? Attempts have been made in the past to reconstruct the written sources which are supposed to lie behind the Synoptic Gospels. Form-Geschichte, the latest school of criticism, has now concentrated upon the problem of the oral sources which precede the written sources and its proponents have sought to reconstruct this material and evaluate it. It is naturally assumed that if there has been development in the written traditions there would be similar development in the oral transmission of the traditions of Jesus. However, there is no way of pursuing this research in the oral sources apart from a fresh literary study of the Gospels as they lie before us in written form. No one can actually get back to the oral transmission itself. But it is proposed that there are certain "laws" of oral transmission which may be formulated by which to check the process,

[1] Reference should be made to Dr. C. H. Dodd's new book, *History and the Gospel,* which was published after this paper was composed. It strongly reinforces some of the arguments of this paper.

and, also, that the situations in the life of the early Christian groups (*Sitz in leben*) may be discerned and that a study of these situations will reveal the process of modification and development in the tradition. This study is of value, but its results are of necessity speculative. In the first place, it is questionable whether there are actually "laws" of oral transmission. There may be tendencies and normal propensities in the transmission of tradition from one generation to another by oral rather than written means, but *laws,* invariable chains of cause and effect, can hardly be formulated where the human element enters in. Moreover, the reconstruction of the *Sitz in leben* with any definite particularity and the fixing of any part of the tradition in that particular *Sitz* involves a high degree of speculation. If there is still no consensus as to the dating of the written Gospels, can we ever hope for any real consensus as to the date of any particular bit of oral tradition? Is the "situation in life" to which the bit is to be referred A. D. 35 or A. D. 95? Who can ever know?

The results of this type of research thus far appear to be generally skeptical and negative as regards the authenticity of the presentation of Jesus in the Gospels. The critics seem to be of the opinion that the process of modification which went on during the period of oral transmission was so drastic that what we now have in the written Gospels is, say, nine parts modification to a possible one part history. One gathers that Bultmann might not allow even this one part to remain. Some of the critics seem fascinated by the changes and modifications which occur as the tradition is passed on from one stage to another. Indeed, it is their business to note these things. But it is possible so to concentrate one's attention on the differentia that the abiding unity of the tradition may be overlooked. As Stephen Leacock suggests, one may look at a billiard-ball close enough to discover that it is all covered with bumps. This may give us a hint as to the value of the *conclusions* of some of the critics. They sit with eye glued to the microscope looking at the minutiæ of the ball's surface and never take the ball to the table for a game where they might realize its fundamental sphericity. Dean Inge recognizes that "no real biography of Jesus Christ can ever be written, and much that we should like to know remains uncertain. But," he continues, "the figure of the Saviour is not shadowy; His character lives; the Gospels give us a genuine portrait."

It is well that the Form-Geschichte school has called special attention to the significance of the oral transmission of the traditions. Oral teaching and preaching and the personal influence of the teacher and preacher were originally and still are the primary means of producing

Christian faith and character. Must it be assumed that the recollections of the eye-witnesses of Jesus (Luke 1:2) as they were passed on from ear to ear and from generation to generation were so molded or distorted to fit changing conditions that very little historically reliable material was finally written down in the records which we have in the Gospels? Is the oral transmission of tradition essentially unreliable? Extensive observations of the life of the people in China where illiteracy prevails, where the written word plays a minor part in the lives of the masses of the people, and where the traditions and customs are handed on from generation to generation by word of mouth, incline me to wariness in accepting the drastic reductions of authentic Gospel material which some critics enjoin. The modern Occidental carries most of his information in his books; if he wants to recall something he turns to his library or his filing cabinet. But the Oriental villager carries his knowledge in his head.[2] Illiteracy is not synonymous with ignorance. To be a fisherman is not necessarily to be "a poor fish." The villagers are in possession of real knowledge even though they did not get it out of books. The necessity of depending upon memory results in the development of the power to remember. And the simplicity of life sets limits upon what has to be remembered: the mind of the villager is not confused by the thousand and one things that beat upon our heads from newspapers, books and radio. As a Chinese student once remarked to me concerning these simpler countrymen of his: "They may know less, but they remember it better." I knew an illiterate cook whose memory was literally stored with ancient moral maxims which he would quote on appropriate occasions. It would be a rare Chinese peasant who did not know or could not tell the stories of the twenty-four filial sons, or the tales from the saga of Chu Ko Liang, and tell them substantially as they have been told for generations. In the temple courtyards on market-days are professional story-tellers who read or recite to the crowds who gather round, the historic tales of old Cathay. Simple people who have no books of their own stand or sit for hours to listen to these stories, though many of them know them already by heart through constant hearing. Like children who have heard the story of the Three Bears time and again and still plead with mother to tell it again, they are not bored by repetition. When Doctor Dibelius writes of "sermons," in the book already referred to, he seems to be thinking of discourses set within definite time limits and not of extreme length.[3] But there were no watches in

[2] I should say that it is just the reverse of what Doctor Dibelius suggests as the case in his remark: "People of less education among the preachers must often have relied more upon papyrus than upon memory" (opus cit. p. 39).

[3] "Only short passages could be introduced into a sermon"—(opus cit. p. 48).

the pockets of those who listened to the evangelists of the first century, and life was leisurely and unhurried (as it still is in much of the Orient today). When Peter came along there were men and women happy to sit for hours while he recounted at length his experiences with his Master. Didn't Paul talk most of the night at Troas and only one boy fell asleep. Even after the accident to the boy the talk continued until break of day. Why is it inherently improbable that the apostles should have told the story of Jesus with much the same outline as that in Mark and all at one sitting? Or that not a few believers should have heard the story many times and had it fixed indelibly upon their minds? At least this is no more fantastic than many other explanations. The exact day or the precise setting of the incident or of the telling of a particular parable might not be remembered, might not be considered of any importance, but the essential glimpse of Jesus which the evangelist would give could not be forgotten.

Even those who knew how to read depended largely upon their memories. There were no printed books, and manuscripts were few. In those days, and until recent years, in China, school boys memorized their lessons and scholars were famous for their prodigious memories. For a Chinese scholar to be able to recite the whole Confucian canon was no uncommon thing. The president of Shantung Christian University, Doctor Liu, told me that his mother, who was a Christian, made him spend the first three years of his schooling memorizing the New Testament. He knew it all by heart, with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which his mother did not require of him because she said she didn't know who wrote it. Very early in the history of the church it would have been natural for catenæ of the maxims and parables which Jesus uttered, as well as tales of his life, to be formulated for the instruction of new members and these would be memorized. The pathos and pricelessness of these memories and the fact that there were many disciples to check one another would exert some influence, at least, against the corruption or distortion of the tradition.[4] It is asserted by some,

[4] Dr. James Moffatt in his new commentary on 1 Corinthians in commenting upon Paul's statements in 7: 10, 12 and 25 as to the Lord's injunctions and his own advice remarks: "The explicit care with which Paul here . . . distinguishes between what is his own ruling (not the Lord's) and a definite saying of the Lord (verse 10) is a significant indication that, although as a prophet he had divine revelations, he did not cast them into the form of what Jesus had once said, in order to invest them with authority. Apostles and prophets as well as teachers drew on a living tradition of eye-witnesses which preserved utterances of Jesus, and their responsible task was primarily to transmit such original sayings. It was plainly a responsibility which was felt to involve not merely keenness of memory, but scrupulous veracity. An incidental remark like this of Paul's tells against the notion that gifted men in the primitive communities felt inspired to produce, by a free use of their devout imagination, sayings of the Lord to suit the requirements of the cult. Words of Jesus might be and were modified as well as molded in the course of transmission, but they did not come into being by a process of spontaneous generation. Whether Paul carried such sayings entirely in his memory or whether

however, that the early disciples were interested in *nothing* but the end of the world which they expected almost immediately, and therefore they were utterly indifferent as to the preservation of memories of Jesus. But even if this hypothesis is accepted (I do not accept it), it does not follow that the disciples would not share their memories of Jesus with others regardless of what might happen in the immediate future. If Jesus was at all the extraordinary person and the marvelous teacher whom the Gospels describe, his impression upon people would be so vivid that they could never contain within themselves what they knew about him, could never cease from telling all who might listen what they had heard him say and seen him do. And those who heard them would not forget either! This is not to deny at all that later writers, such as composed our extant Gospels, worked over the materials that came to their hands, rearranged them, put them in a form to meet contemporary needs, but it is to enter a protest against the verdict of those who declare that the period covered by transmission down to our written Gospels saw such distortion, exaggeration and perversion that what we now have is "little more than the whisper of his voice"—uncertain and unreliable. No one can prove beyond possibility of denial that the glory which appears in the Gospels is the true reflection of the face of Jesus Christ, but it makes sense of the Christian movement if it is acknowledged, and the denial is a *reductio ad absurdam*. Quite as important in estimating the authenticity of the deeds and words of Jesus, by investigation of written records, is a recognition of the fact of Christian character, the reflection of the influence of Jesus, continuous from the earliest times down to the present. That is an apostolic succession which cannot be denied. The church was not the product of a book, but of a life; literature was the by-product of this life and not its source. It has been suggested that the early church grew as "One loving soul set another on fire." The early disciples had no doubt in their own minds that there was an original flame which set their souls on fire—a flame and not a bit of fog that touched them off. They understood Paul's meaning when he wrote: "Be ye imitators of me even as I also am of Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1). And the stories which they handed on from those early days, their memories of Jesus, still possess the authentic fire of that original flame: they set our own hearts ablaze!

they were already written down, it is impossible to say; they formed an important part of his methods in Christ Jesus. But the clear point is that he drew a line between such authenticated sayings and his own opinions, even when the latter were opinions in a 'judicial' sense. If anyone in the primitive church had creative literary genius, it was Paul. It is historically of high importance that he did not feel at liberty to create a saying of Jesus even when, as here, it would have been highly convenient in order to settle a disputed point of Christian behavior" (p. 80).

What shall be said in reply to those who consider the teachings of Jesus irrelevant to our times because of the fantastic apocalyptic basis upon which they are supposed to rest? There are undoubted points of contact between Jesus and the apocalyptists. But the Jesus who is portrayed in the Gospels can be made into another Baruch or Enoch only by what Dr. Hastings Rashdall calls "a forced and tortuous exegesis." The Jesus of the Gospels can't even be fitted comfortably into the framework of the New Testament Apocalypse of John: perhaps that may explain in part the difficulty this writing had in getting into the canon. The divergencies between Jesus and the apocalyptists are more striking than the similarities. In his message of the Kingdom there was judgment and crisis, impending doom or impending blessing, dependent upon the nation's rejection or acceptance of the reign of God. But he proclaimed forgiveness and the grace of God. Miss Lily Dougall observes: "Jesus came into the world which could not conceive of a God who did not, in the long run, take terrible vengeance on all his enemies. . . God was not thought of as able to overcome sin and save sinners: it was only by the destruction of all the ungodly and sinners that God and good could prevail. . . Apocalyptic belief was that in the end God's only way to get rid of sin was by the extermination of unrepentant sinners from the earth exactly as men rid themselves of the trouble of vermin. . . Those classed for destruction were (1) all idolaters, (2) all nations who had ever interfered with the Jews, (3) all Jews who were indifferent to the strict observation of the Law. . . They had no idea that God could work in the hearts of the unrepentant or that God and the unrepentant could meet in love" (*The Lord of Thought-passim*). Listen to Enoch: "And behold, He cometh with ten thousand of His holy ones to execute judgment upon all and to destroy the ungodly; to convict all flesh of all the works of their ungodliness which they have ungodlily committed and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him. . . And for you sinners there shall be no salvation, but on you shall abide a curse" (1:9). If Jesus was just another apocalyptist how strange that the impression has been gathered, as Sir John Seeley put it, that "forgiveness is Christ's most striking innovation in morality. When a Christian spirit is spoken of, it may be remarked that a forgiving spirit is usually meant." Yet the judgment of the author of Ecce Homo is confirmed by the Jewish scholar, Dr. Claude Montefiore in his *Jewish Religion of the First Century:* "People (of Jewish race) who had fallen or were fallen away from the ranks of those who honestly sought to observe the law, were neglected and shunned by the teachers and by the law-abiding Jews. They were looked upon and disliked as ignorant, as law-breakers, as unclean. And

it was a marked weakness of this legal religion that while it taught and its votaries practiced compassion to the poor and the afflicted, if they sought to obey the law, it did not teach redemptive compassion and kindness to those who fell away." In a book on "The Religious Teaching of Jesus" the same scholar remarks: "The Rabbis attached no less value to repentance than Jesus . . . They, too, welcomed the sinner in his repentance. But to seek out the sinner, and instead of avoiding the bad companion, to choose him as your friend in order to work his moral redemption, this was, I fancy, something new in the religious history of Israel" (p. 57). And in his commentary on the Synoptic Gospels Doctor Montefiore, in contrasting the message of Jesus and that of the apocalyptists, writes: "The real greatness of Jesus consisted in that side of his teaching which was independent of these old watchwords and battle-cries" (p. 58).

In their emphasis upon the apocalyptic element in the New Testament, some scholars seem to forget that Jesus and his disciples did not wholly desert the Old Testament in favor of the apocalyptic writings. Jesus may have referred to Enoch—it is not certain—but there is no doubt of the references to non-apocalyptic writings in the Old Testament. And these references show clearly that it was in the prophetic-ethical sections that the most significant element in the Old Testament was discerned, for example: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Matt. 9:13; Hos. 6:6). The ethical motive which is stressed is love of God rather than "the Lord is at hand." The latter appears, but the former predominates. And most of us would recognize Paul in his character as the apostle of love, as a more authentic representative of the Master than the Thessalonian disciples who sat down with folded hands to await the coming of the Lord; just as in our day we should consider Dr. Wilfred Grenfell more Christlike than Alexander Dowie. Paul did have something to say about the coming of the Lord, but he asserted that it was the love of Christ which constrained him, which was the compelling motive of his life. Was this dominant love-motive which we find in the New Testament evoked by the "literary" figures of the later generations of Christians when the illusion of the end of the world had begun to fade, or did it have its source in Jesus and its expression from the first in the life of the church? Were the first disciples "sit-down strikers" waiting for the Lord to do something? It is hard to comprehend how anyone should want to crucify Jesus or persecute his followers if they were simply waiting for God to act! But any serious attempt to practice love across fixed boundaries is sure to meet the opposition of those who uphold the status quo. If we accept Doctor Cadbury's descrip-

tion of Jesus as one who "probably had no definite, unified, conscious purpose" and Doctor Dibelius' description of the first followers as a "company of unlettered people which expected the end of the world any day," then we may be driven to Doctor Bultmann's despair of ever finding out the reasons for the origin of Christianity. But why must it be assumed that the author of 1 John did not comprehend that origin and its extraordinary significance when he declared: "We love him because he first loved us." Is this God-inspired love irrelevant to our concerns today?

"If the object of the teaching is to give *direction* rather than *directions,* to point to the goal of all good living rather than to legislate for particular cases, then the important thing is not whether the goal is near or far, but whether the direction is correct. If the object of Jesus was so to guide his followers that their lives should fit into the great purpose of God, the question whether that purpose would be realized in ten years or ten thousand becomes a minor consideration. Now we must maintain that this was precisely the object. Where Kant says: Act so that the maxims of your will may be in perfect harmony with a universal system of laws, Jesus says: Live so that your will may be in perfect harmony with the purpose of God. That is the purport of 'Thy will be done'—'Be ye merciful as your Father is merciful.' It means, live so that your life is a fulfilment, in part at least, of God's purpose. Whether this purpose in its completeness is to have immediate or ultimate fulfilment is a secondary consideration. The teaching in its inmost meaning is thus bound up with faith, the conviction that the world has meaning which can be expressed in terms of the wise and loving purpose of God: that man's sin and misery can be explained in terms of his opposition to that purpose and cured by a new submission of man's will to God, and that by this submission man's life acquires new unity, new meaning, new direction, new hope." Let this quotation from Dr. T. W. Manson (*The Mission and Message of Jesus*—p. 329) suffice as our answer to those who like Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes consider that, because Jesus was not a modern sociologist, he is not competent to give us advice today. The fundamental facts of human nature have not changed since the time of Jesus and show no signs of changing. Our deepest need is not competent opinions on specific problems. We need something to make us care to be good. Dr. W. E. Hocking analyzes the situation: "We do not care to be any better. We cannot make ourselves care. But we find that we do care when we learn that God cares, when we realize our worth. How do we know that God cares? From Jesus' life of sacrifice, motivated only by concern for the possibilities of human nature."

Was there ever a time in history when there was more desperate need for a motive in life, high enough to transcend the divisions of race and blood, of nation and class, strong enough to subdue the hatreds which today presage an apocalyptic catastrophe, not for a little nation like Israel, but for civilization itself? Where can such a motive be found save in an unreserved submission to the loving will of the All-Father God and a whole-hearted acceptance of his reign as Jesus taught it, lived it and died for it two thousand years ago?

THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

OSCAR FISHER BLACKWELDER
Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C.

A NEEDY world is the environment of modern education. There is probably no more fundamental social expression of this need than the forms of government under which many men live today. In some nations it is practically impossible for the average person to practice these personal, domestic, and community virtues we call Christian. To say that all the powers that be are ordained of God is a difficult thesis to defend.

A recent civic club speaker eloquently climaxed a speech with these words: "When Fascism has had its day, when Communism has had its sway, democracy will live." The members applauded patriotically. But democracy does not have the power of self-perpetuation. Perpetual motion has not been discovered in physics, economics, or political science. That is to say, systems do not rule the world. Unsupported democracy is not the antithesis to Fascism or Communism. Someone has truly said, "He who can spiritualize democracy will save the world." That means to undergird democracy with those principles and ideals that gave it birth.

Here enters the church. The church is commissioned not with an exclusive but an inclusive gospel. A sect is concerned with its own class, but the church is concerned with humanity both in and outside her membership. The Christian church was prototyped by that shadowy band of mysterious figures called the prophets, who spoke not to a little company of Hebrew saints but to a nation with such vision of truth and justice as God gave them utterance. Jesus spoke not only to his disciples but to his nation or they never would have put him on the cross. The western world was Paul's parish and he championed the cause of Christ before emperor and philosopher. Martin Luther surely believed in justification by faith for the individual, but ample references are available to show that no social problem of his generation was beyond his concern. The social task of organized religion in our day is to spiritualize democracy and probably at no point is this more constructively and creatively possible than in the field of higher education. The immediate future of our civilization is bound up with the system of education we maintain. This means a study of the church college.

In a presentation of this subject, my first proposition is, WHAT THE CHURCH OWES THE COLLEGE. I suggest four obligations.

1. The church owes the college teacher freedom of thought and speech and the privilege of an open mind, but a well-operated church college should lay down as a fundamental requirement for its faculty definite evangelical commitments, not hazy general faith in some kind of religion or spiritualized ethics. Church-college faculties should have not only specialized training in their respective fields but should be able intelligently to interpret historical Christianity in terms of their fields.

A teacher of physics, for example, who has come to a constructive Christian faith through his study of physics, in addition to his mastery of his field, is ready to teach physics in a church college. It is to such a person on a college faculty that the church at large owes the privilege of further freedom of experiment and discovery unhampered by dogmatic definitions or social restrictions.

Lack of intelligent faith on anyone's part, especially a teacher's, is confession of immaturity, which may be the price of overspecialization. Yet, when all the questions of life are over in anyone's mind, the quest of life is done. We see through a glass darkly. But notice: we see through—and that saves us. We see through darkly—that challenges us. So the progress of mankind is marked by gains made by original thinkers. A man who is only a copyist can never fully interpret a creative Christ. He calls us not servants, who simply take orders, but friends, who share his mind and creative spirit. Christianity is not a pool of water whose depth, density, and circumference can be definitely measured by any man's mind. Christianity is a spring of water rising in the hills of God which flows into each life somewhat differently. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." The way of Christ is "Come, let us reason together," and that does not imply metallic agreement. Who shall be the instrument through which the Spirit of Truth leads society by way of the church into larger truth? He is the student and teacher with an intelligent moral commitment ready for further adventure and discovery. "He that willeth to do shall know." "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see."

This conception of moral and spiritual commitment with intellectual openmindedness is the genius of Protestantism. It is the church's Pauline heritage in every generation. There is no place in the church's program where a laboratory of free scholarship may be conducted more practically and constructively than in a church college. The church owes the college freedom to do so without any dogmatic or social limitations. If the church is to advance beyond her history and tradition, it will be because the church's scholars are unhampered. The church too frequently has been willing to speak only the word good and authentic for all the

ages. And some words she possesses are like that. But the church must also be willing to speak the next best word she can grasp and she must be ready in the spirit of experiment, even by the process of elimination, the method of trial and error, to be led into larger truth.

2. The church owes the college support for its experiments in finer ways of living. We are called to be coworkers with God to help finish this incomplete world. The church is more than a conservator; she can also be a creator. The college is one of her best instruments for doing so. The reference now is to experiments in living that are possible on a college campus. The church needs to regard her colleges as experimental stations, social laboratories, testing and proving grounds for advancements in living. One great weakness of education has been abstraction, teaching books and theories apart from living issues. When concepts of higher learning become so specialized and rarefied that they cannot be understood by the average lay group, to say nothing of actual application, the process ceases to be education. The college campus is a little world in itself. It can be a miniature republic. It may be an experiment in democracy. It might even be a form of collective bargaining or a cooperative commonwealth.

Most of our church colleges have small student bodies and for the purpose now under consideration this is very well. In a small college the social philosophy which encourages fraternities and sororities is to be questioned. Fraternities tend to teach men to be club men instead of community citizens. Living together as one commonwealth, feeling the responsibility of one brotherhood and not of little Greek-letter sects, eating in the same mess-hall, is a training for that kind of democracy which may be around the corner in America.

This paves the way for a general and brief treatment of so-called extra-curricula activities. Too many colleges are operated on the principle that a student's time is entirely his own outside the classroom and perhaps one chapel service a week. Literary societies are too often dead and public-speaking courses inadequate in a day when civic clubs, parent-teacher associations, citizen organizations, political groups, professional clubs are crying for leadership. There is no business or professional man today who, if he be socially articulate, does not need the ability to think and speak on his feet. Behold the number of college men with no training whatever except in their limited fields of specialization. And not only the college man's inability to think and speak on his feet in public debate, discussion and presentation, is a definite loss, but even more serious is the fact that too many students begin to specialize even in the sophomore class and gradually think entirely in terms of their

skills with no training in the humanities. For fifteen years this writer has been quite active in civic club work, and it is tragically amazing to observe how few men have been trained to think on social questions. Every college campus should require "town meetings" where social issues, with which students must deal later, would be debated.

In a certain college town a class in sociology is definitely at work to rid the town of a small slum section existing in that otherwise very desirable community. Think what a training in citizenship such activity can mean. The church has been too content with acts of mercy instead of giving herself through her best students for search into and attack upon those causes, like slums, which make relief-work necessary.

The average college student needs training in the humanities. No student should be granted a church-college diploma who cannot prove definite social conscience and the power of moral judgment. Training in skills alone is not Christian education.

I am a fervent believer in coeducation. People must live together. Why should they not learn to do so in the democracy and comradeship of a college campus? Where better can talented, dedicated youth choose life companions? Where better can they build corporate dreams for the future? As the college thus endeavors in miniature and epitome to build a better world, the church at large owes respectful and loyal support.

3. The church owes the college financial support adequate to the new day. In this kind of world and at this age in human history, most worthwhile things cost money. It is more than a silent commentary on Karl Marx's economic determinism. There is something very determinative about money. Running a small college and because of that very smallness calling it basically cultural and liberal, emphasizing the close personal association between teacher and student, is only the argument of a private school. Something far more fundamental is necessary to give it Christian appeal to laymen definitely committed to the cause of Christ and the church at large. The church college, like all our inherited institutions, is under fire and on trial. Many colleges are almost closing their doors. Their rating is insecure. They have little more than sentimental ground for appeal unless they have the leadership and faculty to do a definite Christian enterprise. When colleges do this on a broadly evangelical basis, money will come.

4. The church owes the college specially chosen students in addition to that regular stream of youth that turns to the church college for personal, family, or religious reasons. The program indicated in this paper presupposes not only a faculty and money, but it means picked

students, chosen not only from those who are superior in high school scholarship but also from those who give promise of moral and social leadership. Leaders do not happen, they are chosen and called. Church colleges need students capable of the highest scholarship but with capacity for moral excellence and ethical leadership, capable of social passion and therefore of being dynamic personalities in any community and profession. Such students can outlive the world and enable a college to find her destiny.

My second proposition is, WHAT THE COLLEGE OWES THE CHURCH.

1. The college owes the church guidance in social attitudes. As long as the average pastor is required to give a major portion of his time and mental interest to purely administrative and pastoral functions, someone else must do most of the creative thinking for the church. Someone else must provide most of the scholarship. Someone else must do the writing. Except for those rare churches which enable a pastor to be an honest student, this must come largely from educational institutions. The faculties of our church colleges and seminaries must lead the church into intelligent and historical social thinking.

A student leader recently wrote the following: "The church is not a part of the community or the nation. It is the communion of the saints delivered out of the community and nation into the kingdom of God. To make the church an agent for the improvement of the present social order is grossly to misunderstand her function. Her members who receive the Word in good and honest hearts are good citizens." I quote another in reply, "A church indifferent to righteousness, social justice and human welfare must inevitably be discarded by society, for it has departed from the the will of God."

Too many churchmen have been eager to run to state and federal legislatures instead of following the far more evangelical procedure of making a public contribution of their findings after serious study and research. The average churchman of the past half-century has had a decreasing consciousness of his duty to help contribute the Christian insight and solvent on public social questions in the spirit of free debate rather than in the atmosphere of professional reformers and moral policemen. The church at large may become socially alert, responsive and responsible when the leaders of higher education analyze social situations, provide the historical background, and offer suggestive guidance by which the average churchman can make his contribution to his day and generation.

This does not mean simply a declaration of principles. The task of our day is to think and act in terms of principles. What we need is purposeful activity, and purposing includes discriminating thought. The picture is of a student struggling beneath the light of Christ with the ills of the social order that ruin, stain, and crush human life. It means not a hot-tempered crusader (even though that hour may arrive) but a quiet mind saturated with his spirit at grips with the staggering facts of where men live and how they work.

2. The college owes the church at large a philosophy of life in keeping with historical Christianity but adequate to the demands of our day. We need a larger working formula for an expanding universe, one able to take in and interpret larger view-points, facts, and needs.

The growth of a number of small sects, largely made up of derelict and bankrupt Protestants who have never been schooled in a Christian philosophy of life illustrates what this writer means. Many, probably most of these, know the facts of Bible history. The sects have an almost uncanny way of producing Bible students—but students unable to gather these facts into a constructive unit and a wholesome interpretation of life which would guide them to do their real duty to their generation.

Protestantism has been called the religion of living minds. It is surely the spiritual child of St. Paul more than of St. Peter, but many are questioning whether the sons of St. Paul have entered and adventured into the branches of higher education in America with as dedicated a Christian spirit as have the sons of St. Peter. A current magazine has charged that Protestantism is near the zero point as a culture-producing influence—that its colleges now conceive themselves as secular institutions, that all illusion as to their possession of any special religious character has vanished, that Protestantism has surrendered its earlier sense of responsibility for higher education.

Whether this be true to any degree, the question remains, who has done the philosophical thinking of America during the past quarter-century and what has been its outcome? Dr. John Dewey says, "The chief characteristic of the present age is its despair of any constructive philosophy. The result is disillusionment." Listen to Theodore Dreiser, "I find life to be a complete illusion and mirage. The best I can say is that I haven't the faintest notion of what it is all about unless it is for self-satisfaction. I pass quite as I came, confused and dismayed." Listen to Bertrand Russell, "We must build the future on the firm foundations of unyielding despair." And hear this note of futility in Joseph Wood Krutch, "We are carried nearer to that state in which existence is a vast emptiness."

In other words, experimentalism in philosophy has made its contribution, which has been great—but something is left out. The Christian student has been so ridiculed by the experimentalist that he begins with a definite set of postulates, and ends by knowing how it will all come out, with perfect answers in the back of his book. What the experimentalist has failed to see and what his present disillusionment confesses is that there is no such thing as presumptionless thinking. The choice of a goal is the confession of a desired end—that is a presupposition.

I am indebted to a friend for the word by which we can describe the present world situation. It is the big-little word, "split." The world is split vertically into nations. Nations are split horizontally into races. Races are split obliquely into classes. Homes are split, as the increasing divorce rates indicate. The growth of mental hospitals and clinics seems to indicate the increase of split personalities. We have been leaving out the things that bind life together. The world needs some kind of cement. It is the Christian thesis that this is the meaning of religion. The very word religion means a bond—uniting men to God, to all men everywhere, and a bond which becomes one's integrating principle uniting his own life and preventing a split personality. Such religion is not superstition and blind faith but intelligent confidence. When such faith goes, suspicion and fear enter—hate follows—and destruction is inevitable. To put a God-centered hypothesis into the very marrow of life is the privilege of higher education.

3. The college owes the church leadership in an aggressive conflict with non-Christian attitudes on life and society.

The church has historically a primal obligation to challenge non-Christian educational polity and practice on an adult level. If certain trends in high school, college and university are held undesirable, the place to begin the attack upon these trends is with the creative minds who do the first line educational thinking and planning. The church's fundamental task now isn't to save youth through question-fellowship periods around teacups. It is in aggressive conflict with the relative presuppositions and view-points of Christian and non-Christian conceptions of life, society, and education. The schoolman writes his books, the churchman writes his and seldom the twain meet. They misunderstand or hold in contempt each other's vocabularies and thought-patterns. This is not to imagine two armies arrayed against each other, for the problem is far more subtle and serious than that. It is more like the work of Professor McDougall in psychology, Professor Ellwood in sociology, Professor Van Dusen in philosophy of religion, Professor Reinhold Niebuhr in ethics. It is probably in these fields that the struggle

is centered. Forces are militantly at work to belittle religion and sneer at the church; to put the church out of education or to destroy the church's educational system; to place the states and the federal government in complete control of all education. The point of this argument is that the rebuttal to such forces cannot be given on the student level alone but on the adult level where the source of the belittling and sneering lies. It is not simply a question of defense but rather of creative scholarship at desk and in classroom, dedicated in the spirit of St. Paul for our day. This must either come from the faculties of our church colleges and theological seminaries or men must be released for this tremendous and vital service. Why should the church ever be on the defense and take the negative? She is the establishing agent in higher education. Why shall she simply defend and refute today?

4. The college owes the church the training of students really committed to the cause of Christ for the world. It is sheer folly for the church to continue to support even in part colleges that turn out personal and social pagans. The kind of graduates for which this paper pleads may be very intolerant with many churches they find at home, but to the cause which the church so often inadequately represents the student will be definitely committed. It may be that our denominational system is doomed in the best minds and affections of finer youth. And why should we force upon our children our divisions, our definitions, and our prejudices? If our fathers had the right to separate, have not we the right to unite?

Most church colleges are not in metropolitan areas. Let me, therefore, use Washington, D. C., as an illustration of this last point. Why should Washington pastors encourage their church youth to leave home for attendance at a church college when we have in Washington five white universities and one colored, besides several colleges and training schools? Especially is the question real when some pastors in the city have done the necessary work and paid the high and hard price which equips them to guide their students into constructive Christian life—men able to deal morally and spiritually with higher education and probably more qualified than many church college faculties. Why should such pastors take the chance on a college faculty to send back their youth confused, dismayed and indifferent to the Christian appeal? The argument, that if one carries a proper foundation to college his faith will not be injured, has two weaknesses: the one is we are not concerned with its being injured, we want it developed; and if only the foundation matters, why have a church college at all? When you have adequate educational facilities at home, why go away to a church college? The only answer

is that the church college must be prepared to provide total training in character building, social outlook, and Christian commitment which even the finest combination of pastor and independent school cannot provide. "The whole of Christian education might almost be described as experiments with the hypothesis of a Christlike God. Students must be led to test this hypothesis in every field of learning, a process whereby we really apprehend God. There must be and there can be religious vividness at the center of a whole college enterprise."

ON BEING REALISTIC IN RELIGION

HENRY B. ROBINS
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

Even theology falls under the contemporary mood of disillusion. Even the faithful fall victims of the fear of being duped by their best hopes. The best of us reexamine our assumptions, the worst of us rearrange our prejudices; and we all call it being "realistic." In any case, it is a plastic age, and the press and the pulpit teem with ideas emergent from the common ferment. Two massive volumes, each of which is heralded widely as a contribution to our stabilization upon a more assured basis, are before me as I write. The earlier of these was produced at the instance of the International Missionary Council as a propædeutic and a stimulant to the meeting of that body at Madras, India, in the closing weeks of 1938. Its author, Dr. Hendrick Kraemer, lately become Professor of the History of Religions at the University of Leiden after long service as a missionary, discusses a presumably assigned theme, "The Christian Message to the Non-Christian World," producing a treatise which the Archbishop of York surmises "will supply the principles of missionary policy for our generation." The second of these works the authors produced upon their own initiative, a volume entitled *The Growth of Religion,* in which Professors Wieman and Horton have collaborated, and which, in its second part at any rate, is an exposition of "the new naturalism," as the first is a treatise resting back upon the assumptions of "the new supernaturalism."

I

No attempt can be made, within the limits of this brief paper, to follow the argument of either work in careful detail; and when one fails so to follow the argument, he is always at the hazard of doing less than justice in what he may say about any work. Although Professor Kraemer makes no such division, there are two elements in his treatise. We cannot hope to advance as we ought in the non-Christian world until we have a better understanding of the nature of the Christian faith and as well a clearer comprehension of the non-Christian religions as deeply rooted in specific cultures apart from which they cannot be understood. Kraemer's work is concerned with these two *desiderata.*

In his chosen field of religions, Kraemer is clearly a competent scholar, and his handling of the factual material concerning the religions of the world is, on the whole, objective and informing; so much so that

his manifest scholarship in the field of religions is quite likely to add weight to his interpretation of Christianity, more especially with his less discriminating readers. For our present purpose it is needful only to distinguish between his objective exposition of the different religious systems, and his rather arbitrary forcing all of them into the dual classification of naturalistic and prophetic religions. As a matter of fact, there is no such hard and fast distinction. The classification grows rather out of his basic assumptions as to the nature of religion and his manifest bias against "naturalism," than out of the objective data themselves. He makes no concessions whatsoever to such a view of religion as that implied in Archbishop Söderblom's assertion that "where there is religion there is revelation," or to J. N. Farquhar's conception of Christianity as the "crown of Hinduism," or to Kenneth Saunders' view that the Bhagavad Gita, the Lotus Scripture and the Fourth Gospel were all of them manifestations of the eternal Logos, "the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world." No, Christianity cannot come to terms with these religions, for, at best, they are all mere human achievements, whereas Christianity is a divine donation. Systems of religious thought, philosophies of religion—even those achieved by Christian thinkers, though they be marvelous when considered as human achievements, not being the fruitage of "Biblical realism," which is a direct act of God, are somehow under the curse; for man's best works are only *vitia splendida.*

When it comes to Kraemer's biblical realism, one is immediately aware that the shadow of Karl Barth falls across the page, though perhaps the shadow is composite, and Emil Brunner as well is behind it. In any case, when one asks what Christianity is, he is to be referred to the Bible, a "radically theocentric book," where God appears not only as "the beginning and end of all," but as the eternal "initiative-taker." But, though the Bible confronts man with "the living, eternally active God," for all its intense religious realism, it does not present a theology—all theologies, even that of the prophetic-minded Paul, being human achievements. The Bible is the organ of revelation, which remains forever inaccessible, except as apprehended by faith. The Bible presents the witness of the prophets and apostles, a witness supremely "to the self-disclosure of God in Jesus Christ," a self-disclosure in which the cross is central, being at once a revelation of "God's loving heart and of man's essential blindness." Since without exception the natural man refuses this revelation in Christ, it is "the divine judgment on man." Seen in this light, the heart of the Christian message, which is completely dependent upon revelation, is expressed by saying that Christianity

is "*the* religion of the Incarnation," itself "an unthinkable *act* of divine revelation, becoming a fact at a given moment in history." Equally it may be said that the Christian faith "means justification by faith." God alone can himself "make possible the impossible by his sovereign, creative act of salvation in Jesus Christ." Or, it may be said that the Christian faith is "the announcement of the kingdom of God, a new order of life which finds its center and head in Jesus Christ, an order of life which man, because of his sin and finitude cannot create." This new order of life is "transcendental, superhistorical"; it never can have realization in any temporal, economic, political or cultural order; hence there is no complete guidance for these spheres, but only a perpetual confrontation of life by "God's holy, perfect and saving will." All our approximations to the Kingdom standard will be very poor and incomplete, for all human spheres, not the "world" alone but the church and the lives of Christians, are "full of sin and perversion, often to a satanic degree." It remains for us Christians to discover the implications of complete surrender to the holy will of God, which implications are very important for social, cultural and political life.

Kraemer's biblical realism rejects all philosophy, all idealistic religion, all consistent mystical religion, and all moralism, as being "various endeavors for self-redemption" which "instinctively reject the truth that God and God alone can work redemption." But this does not imply the rejection of theology. However, "good Christian theology," we are told, "will never emerge, in this time of world-confusion, without an open, honest and courageous *religious* confrontation with an orientation upon the concrete realism of the Bible." That realism climaxes in the revelation in Christ, "a free divine act of *redemptive irruption* into the life of man and of the world" (Italics mine). Revelation, one may say, is wholly an "irruption" into the natural order. The revelation, to be sure, is not to be identified with the words of the Bible, but is operative in the experience which the Old Testament in its prophetic aspects embodies, and culminates in the act of God in Christ. It would seem, moreover, that it gathers such momentum as to include the distinctive elements, not only in Pauline theology, but also in post-Pauline, ecumenical Christianity. In his essential biblical realism, Kraemer would include "the Sonship of Christ, his Redeemership, his Godhead, and Incarnation, the Trinity, the doctrine of the Fall," et cetera. These at least are not mainly "historical products," they are of the essence of revelation. Out goes philosophy as handmaid to theology; out goes the social gospel; out goes the whole philosophy of "sharing" built upon the assumption that anybody but a biblical realist has anything to share!

II

The difficulties of the postwar period have enveloped the contemporary world with a vast sense of disillusion, if not of futility. One tidal wave has succeeded another across the sea of history, and we who are in the trough of the sea have great difficulty in seeing anything but the waves, mountain-high on either side. It is not surprising that there should have been born at such a time a general despair of the human, issuing with the irreligious and agnostic in a general pessimism, if not a definite cynicism; and on the part of the religious, in a new transcendentalism and apocalypticism. God becomes the "Wholly Other" once again (for the idea is not new), who is at an even farther remove from this mundane scene than the God of Neo-Platonism, and quite beyond our finding out, except as he flashes his reality athwart the darkness of this world. This revelation does not lie implicit in the nature of things but is an act purely of the divine will. We could not have imagined it and have no possible claim that it should come to us. That it comes to us at all is purely an act of prevenient grace. We have no other resource; we cannot build a social order which shall embody the "kingdom of God," we can only bow in the dust before this austere Deity and await his gracious decision, whether or when to lift us from the dust. All our human agencies and instrumentalities, all our collective devisings and experimentations in mutuality and peace, all our aspirings and dreams, our reflective analyses and resultant plans, are but the presumptuous deposit of our base and rebellious, if unacknowledged striving to displace God with man. Philosophy is arrogance, science is futility or worse. The notion that all these movings upward from the level of the beast, these stirrings after the reason for things, these explorations of possibility, so far from being movements in the life of man in response to a God who in some proper sense has never left his world—however much and often it has left him—are little short of blasphemy. So, at any rate, thinks the radical neo-supernaturalist. Kraemer is not so radical; he has now and again to express his admiration for pagan ideas and non-Christian personalities, for human philosophies as magnificent deposits of human creativity. And therein lies a paradox. For all these, after all, are but vain and futile, except as this specific historic channel of divine illumination and redemption shall be opened up to them. "Natural" is a very good word with which to damn a system, a movement, or an epoch. Strange how a new connotation may give a word such satanic implications.

III

In many respects, the work of Professors Wieman and Horton, *The Growth of Religion*, is at the opposite pole from Kraemer's. The volume, however, and the common title, are the rooftree above two essentially distinct works, little more than incidentally connected with each other. Part I is a very competent, though severely condensed, outline of the history of religions, under the title "The Historical Growth of Religion." The only exception which one might take to the first part of the volume, unless he wished to be meticulous, would probably be with the final chapter which deals with "The Nature of Religion in the Light of Its History," and is presumably assumed to embody a proper induction from the body of material previously presented. The query would be whether the definition, which is rather obviously framed with a view to what is to follow in the second part of the volume, is properly an induction from the materials presented, and whether it does not too much overlook that quality of high religion by virtue of which the worshiper seeks God for his own sake and not that he may use him as a means to the further organization to value. I have in mind what *The Shorter Catechism* emphasized in its first article: that the chief end of man was "to glorify God *and enjoy him* forever" (Italics mine).

The second part of the work, under the heading "Contemporary Growth of Religion," is actually a presentation of Professor Wieman's version of "the new naturalism" as a philosophy of religion, set over against the foil of its chief rivals for the allegiance of those who in our time seek the path of high religion—traditional supernaturalism, liberalism, humanism and the new supernaturalism. Of these all, the new naturalism and the new supernaturalism are the most vigorous growths now in the field. The present work represents no particular change of view or advance on earlier statements of Professor Wieman, yet it is more systematic, and is set forth in contradistinction to the present phases of these rival movements, which fact often serves to make it more apparent what Mr. Wieman means.

The new naturalism, be it understood, is not by intent a reductive naturalism; it is distinctly and avowedly "theistic naturalism." The new naturalism is preeminently assured of the fact of God; we have observational evidence that God is, and have no need to speculate about his existence. On the other hand, the question *what* God is cannot be fully answered, though we have a very concrete knowledge of God in the definitive aspect of growth. The most definitive thing about the order of nature, of which we are a part, is growth. Growth is creative synthesis;

but growth and evolution are not identical terms, for evolution has its negative and disintegrative side, whereas growth is integrative only. Now in our search for God we are seeking "the operative reality which makes the world better"; in our quest we come upon the competitive augmentation of evil, which tends always to fixation and thus to self-destruction. But over against this is the growth of the good, the growth of meaning, the growth of mutuality. Now it is just in growth, unlimited growth, that we find what we are seeking—"the living God!" God cannot be the total cosmos, nor can he be identified with the creator of the universe (we know nothing about creation as primordial origination). God must be "something *in* the universe." God is just that, for he is the unlimited growth of the good. "God is not nature and he is not the universe, but he is the growth of living connections of value in the universe."

God is flatly not personal; but this is not intended reductively since it is affirmed that God "must be something that is more rich and pervasive and precious than any personality could ever be." The language of personality, however, is retained, since God is referred to by use of the personal pronoun *he;* this practice is due to the limitations of language, which apparently has stopped with the personal as its highest category. It is, however, a too-limiting one, in Wieman's view, suggesting that God must have a "viscerally controlled consciousness" as we have. To be sure, we shall continue speaking of God as "our Father," realizing, however, that it is a figurative term. It stands for the fact that God, as we are assured, bestows upon each of us a love more tender and pervasive than the love of any personality can ever be. Interesting, if true! What do we know of any love whatsoever which is not personal? But perhaps love, too, like "our Father," is but figurative. Yet Wieman is careful to say that "God is not impersonal, meaning subpersonal, but is superpersonal," an assertion which gives us no defined idea or suggestion of what a "superpersonal" being may be like.

If we wish to know more about the nature of God, there are, we are told, two indispensable avenues of approach to that knowledge. The first is a shared experience of religious creativity; this is brought about by worship rightly understood and shared. Worship, prayer, establish an appreciative responsiveness of the total personality to God, and one enters thus into a deepened experience of the reality which is God. By this means we have immediate, empirical contact with God and share in those forms of religious apprehension which are native to religion. Very well; but can you arrive at a theology that way—through religious experience? Contemporary criticism has administered the *requiescat* to

the once popular theology of religious experience, by showing that the words it employed were shot through with pervasive ambiguity—so it is alleged. But experience is not wholly ambiguous. And at this point we come to the second avenue of approach to the knowledge of God. Assuming with the new naturalists that God is within the cosmic whole and that he is to be known as other realities are known—that is, through our psycho-physical organisms and through communication with others, we proceed to make a rational induction from our bodily and social experience (instead of attempting a spurious armchair use of pure reason). God, in other words, is to be known by using the same basic principles which the physicist employs, or the statesman, or the master mechanic—by right adjustment, that is, and logical induction from the consequences. The idea of God as growth (growth of mutual support, of meaning, of the good, etc.) becomes an "operational idea"—an idea, that is, which is employed to guide practical behavior. God as "unlimited growth" seems to meet all the requirements of such an operational idea: it is specific in its trend, but flexible and inclusive. But, since God is not the "Wholly Other" of the new supernaturalism, the idea employed to give content is not, as the term "God" with the new supernaturalists, a symbolic idea pure and simple; for it does not divest the term "God" of all rational structure. It is important, however, to realize, in Wieman's view of it, that only as we "live with God in God's way," can we come to know God in any significant sense. The knowledge of God is not to be speculatively established.

It is perhaps equally important, in the view of the new naturalism, to know something about the nature and destiny of man; although, in contrast to humanism, the new naturalism majors on God. Since man is a single organic whole, the question about his nature cannot be answered without turning to the biological, the anthropological, the psychological and the social understanding of man. Man is one with nature in much, but he differs from the rest of nature in that he laughs, talks, plays imaginatively, uses tools and machines, reasons, worships and rears a culture. But he does not live this life without strain; he experiences conflict, is the battleground of a great fight, evermore to be fought. Man may fail; and when he does, "the growth of God" begins to fail and to die. The deepest urge of his nature is "toward unlimited growth," but he also experiences a tendency to fixate a definite order of life; accumulation and fixation militate against growth, and man comes under the domination of his own techniques, programs and ideals. His only salvation from all this is complete commitment "to the total will of God before this is fully known, and then the utmost use of sensitivity and

intelligence to find it in each concrete situation." We need at this point, however, sharply to distinguish "governance by human idealism" from the religious way, which puts "the uncomprehended good will of God" in place of ideals "as sovereign over life." The only way of social salvation is "absolute commitment to the total good of God before we know what its specific nature may be." We can speak of one who accepts this way as accepting Jesus Christ "as only Lord and Master," since he stands for that way of life "in which the only sovereign control is the uncomprehended will of God." Now all this possibility and promise of an experience of God in one's life carries with it no intimation or promise of immortality. Indeed, Wieman is quite certain that we cannot claim that the soul has any kind of continued existence after death. We must accept death; and the simplest way to conquer it is to "take it as a completion and an ending." In fact, if we are absolutely committed to God, we can even welcome death "as the only means of rearing an order of life that is cumulatively enriched by the contribution of successive generations." In that view of it, God must mean all that he is to mean in the brief span during which one is privileged to live in this present world, or the longer span that the race will inhabit this earth; for there is no life beyond this mortal span. The eternal, we are told, "is the order of value which is God," but we are bound to ask, will God exist when and if growth ceases to characterize this cosmos? Wieman admits the vast deal that the new naturalism does not profess to know; he is emphatic that it can know nothing of beginnings, and he has no other eschatology than the growth of value, in which presumably any mortals who are alive and remain may share. But one judges that he does not mean to maintain the eternity of God in any sense unrelated to natural growth within this cosmos which we now know in part. If there is some vast "heat-death" of worlds, then, presumably, this would also be the death of God. But why worry! We shall not be there to be appalled by it.

IV

If one seems to blow both hot and cold on this version of the new naturalism, it is because one finds in it both naïveté and unusual penetration, because its proposed method seems suggestive and its results deficient and disquieting. No doubt the reply would be that he who wishes to be scientific in this inquiry must expect results which are both tentative and measurably short of complete satisfaction; yet that the only justified approach of a philosophy of religion must be empirical, inductive. The effort to substitute a "one-world world-view" for the traditional dualism,

which located both reality and value in "another world," and found this world, the only one we know experimentally, wholly deficient, except as, by occasional inthrust Deity might provide, is an attempt with which many will heartily sympathize. That is a very inadequate treatment of the "supernatural" which finds no domicile for the values of the supernatural within the natural. Too long this world has been viewed by the religious as wholly devoid of religious resource and significance, except as God might "break in" with light and help from the realm which he characteristically inhabits—his heaven of heavens. The laying of that "ghost of the 'other world,'" as Bosanquet once called it—the other world being the upper half of that ancient two-story scheme of things—is a good thing only if reality and value can be affirmed and empirically apprehended where they actually are, viz., within our experienced world, conceived not in static, finished patterns, but dynamically. Doctor Wieman's effort toward this desired end must be welcomed by all who suffer from the tensions and paradoxes of the traditional view.

Yet in framing his "operational idea" of God, in which God is set forth not as growth merely, but as growth of the good, Doctor Wieman has taken a value concept and refused to set it in that frame of reference which alone can give it significance. In the perspective in which he views it, "the good" can be good only as it is apprehended as such; it is not *de facto* a good until it is actually valued as such, until it is a good to somebody. Up to a certain point, then, it can be only the conditional setting of an ultimately emergent good. Structure, integration, are present in the process of the cosmos long before life and mind emerge. Unless there is an antecedant Valuer, its seems incongruous to call the growth of structure and the process of integration upon the prehuman level, value, or the good—except as an anticipated consequence. Even more curious is his insistent endowment of "the growth of connections of value" with the capacity to love, and to love more tenderly and pervasively than any person can. If he can affirm so much of God, why is not personality the clue at least to the best available "operational idea" of God? And if personality is to be rejected altogether, what is the significance of saying that God is "superpersonal"! How does one get from the subpersonal to the superpersonal while ignoring the personal?

Will philosophy of religion be content, at Doctor Wieman's suggestion, to vacate its whole interest in origins as a region about which we know and can know nothing? God is not Creator, in his view of the matter; and how this scheme of things got started, we simply have to confess that we do not know: *ignoramus,* if not also *ignorabimus.* The advantage claimed for this view is that, at least, it has no problem of evil.

God is not the universe, so he is not implicated in those negative and disintegrative moments in the evolutionary history of the cosmos; since he is not Creator and is only the positive, creative, value- and meaning-producing process—the integrative as contrasted with the disintegrative, he cannot in any way be charged with responsibility for the presence of evil in the scheme of things. One is reminded of an ancient view which holds that God could not have produced a world so manifestly evil; hence it must have been the work of a *demiurge*. But there is not even a *demiurge* provided in this scheme; the whole question of ultimate origins and ultimate goals is left suspended in mid air. Yet perhaps, as Dewey says, we do not solve these ancient problems; we simply recover from them, and do not ask such foolish questions any longer. Or are such questions foolish? Can the axiological interest be separated from the cosmological by any such gulf as this position implies? Where does this whole integrative, value-creating process get its push-off?

There is much to be said for Professor Wieman's view of the personal religious technique by which the value of God, the meaning of God, the divine dynamic, may be appropriated. But it still must be urged that, prior to the question how one shall worship is the question what one shall worship, what idea of God one shall cherish. The open, plastic soul is not perforce one from which all patterns are erased, one which has ceased to cherish all specific ideals. That rearrangement and augmentation of one's habitual patterns of thought to which unconscious process may contribute is mainly dependent upon a life enriched by specific ideals and attitudes and the strenuous and careful endeavor to clarify issues and simplify motives. The apprehension of God may never be comprehension in the full sense, but it must be as specific and defined as the problem aspects of life which one seeks to bring into resolution by means of it. Religious faith must pass beyond the sheer tentativeness of the "operational idea." And if the idea of God which one shall cherish is to be, not a mere dictated pattern from another world, but a genuine induction from one's experienced world, it must answer to other aspects of known world than those of process only. An inductively derived theology cannot be grooved by this one revealing conception alone upon which Doctor Wieman has seized. He cites Charles Hartshorne's approach to the idea of God with approval, but apparently overlooks the fact that for Hartshorne the formula is *deus sive natura,* God *or* Nature, whereas from his own point of view the contention that God and nature (or the cosmic order) are identical must be denied. In both Whitehead and Hartshorne the relatedness of the correlating principle is cosmic; and of the sufficiency of such a relatedness there is no assur-

ance except as it is cosmic. But one who identifies the Universe with God, as both Hartshorne and F. E. England do, has left the actual God of religion behind. No; it would seem that Doctor Wieman must go his own way and substantiate his argument upon its own merits, as indeed he seeks to do, without the full agreement of any other first-rate thinker in the field. And when he concedes, as now and again he does, that one may, instead of saying that growth *is* God, simply affirm that it is the work of God, he is deviating from the straight line of his own thinking; he is deviating, that is to say, unless he intends to open the way, by this intimation, to a content in the idea of God which is expressible only in terms which make God a being who, however immanent within the process, is also truly transcendent of it.

THE QUEST FOR CHRISTIAN STRATEGY

RALPH WALDO NELSON
Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma

We have now had several months in which to consider the "Suggestions for a New Strategy" by Ivan Lee Holt, former President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. (I refer specifically to Chapter V of his book, *The Search for a New Strategy in Protestantism.*)

Here is a truly statesmanlike plan for Christian missions. For the work both at home and abroad Doctor Holt has a most constructive program looking toward further achievements in unity. We should eliminate duplication of agencies, reorganize our world program, devote ourselves to a more definite movement toward Protestant union, and integrate the personal and social aspects of the gospel. All of these are means directed toward presenting the kingdom of God on earth in a more vigorous and appealing way than has been our custom. The Federal Council should be strengthened so that it may more boldly exercise prophetic leadership, and restate what it means to be a Christian in terms as explicit and direct as those used by Communism and Fascism.

These suggestions of Doctor Holt show that his conception of strategy is primarily social. He is thinking of conferences and companionship and agreements among leaders, fellowship which everyone may share now and again on such occasions as preaching missions. But he also calls for a *restatement* of the *meaning* of the Christian life, emphasizing this requirement by saying that it must make clear the relationship between the individual and the social gospel and tell explicitly *what it means* to be a Christian.

Here Doctor Holt cuts deeper than social gatherings; and here indeed is the heart of our problem. How shall we restate what it means to be a Christian? Restatement calls for the use of language; and language is essential not only to human communication and cooperative thinking, but even to the fullest thought-processes of individual minds. How shall we find words to express the riches of the Christian gospel for this day of achievement in the objective world of mechanical invention and mass production, of enormous combinations of capital and growing labor unions, when our inherited religious terminology knows nothing of these current happenings and problems? In short, strategy that involves the restatement of what men hold to be true is basically an intellectual matter. It demands some sort of technique or logical procedure for distinguishing truth from error.

When Doctor Holt challenges his fellow Christians to look for strategy as fundamental as this, it may be helpful to glance backward over Christian history. The apostolic church appears to have had a most efficient strategy. In less than a year from the resurrection of Jesus his loyal disciples had defied and confounded the Jewish authorities and had scattered their faith through all the regions round about. Soon their strategy had conquered the arch-persecutor, Saul of Tarsus, and had made him their apostle to the nations. And by the time death closed their labors, the apostles had established churches throughout the Mediterranean world. In one generation, faced by the indifference and moral degradation of Greece and Rome, and against cruelly enforced opposition in both Rome and Jerusalem, the Christian Church was effectively launched on her sublime career. It should pay us to look for strategy here. Perhaps we may find at the heart of this apostolic program a program of teaching that was content to prove itself by no other means than its fruits in love and service, not only a social and moral strategy, but an intellectual method of distinguishing truth and clarifying its meaning, eminently adapted to the needs of our own day.

But first let us follow the course of history farther. In the third and fourth centuries we discover a change of strategy. The strongest personalities and keenest minds among the Greco-Roman converts were those who had been earnest seekers of truth among pagan philosophies. And when they found yet fuller truth in the Christian teaching and rose to leadership in the church, it was inevitable that they should bring their philosophy and their Socratic habit of mind with them. Naturally, too, they were best able to win converts among the sons and daughters of Greco-Roman culture when they presented the gospel in terms familiar to them. They portrayed the teaching of Jesus more as the truest philosophy or the perfect system of ideas than as a simple and practical way of life.

Thus they Hellenized the gospel. Not until we achieve a point of view that will enable us to discover what moral values the teaching of Jesus may have for our century, shall we be in a position to say at what moral cost was this Hellenization accomplished. But we can be sure of one thing: it failed to recognize the practical procedure, by which the apostles and their converts identified truth by its fruits in overt conduct, as an intellectual procedure at all. Not in any sense was it, to them, a rival for their accustomed mode of thinking; hence they retained, and brought into the church, the intellectual strategy of Socrates.

This strategy of Socrates was simply the conceptualism that college sophomores meet in their first course in philosophy. Socrates found

truth by questioning his fellows until he discovered the composite ideas or concepts on which Athenians essentially agreed. Truth thus came to light in conversation and was preserved in precise verbal statements or definitions. True goodness or virtue, therefore, was attained by mastering the concept or meaning of virtue as an idea. Virtue was knowledge.

Of course Socrates was too great to make this the sum total of his philosophy; but this was essentially what the lesser intellectuals of subsequent centuries retained of his thought. It was the doctrine that virtue was identical with knowledge that set the Gnostics to doctrinizing the Christian gospel. Then rose Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who so ably systematized the gospel, thus formulated and presented, as to make its new strategy effective for fourteen centuries.

Now that we have witnessed the breakdown of Augustinian theology, and have experienced nearly a century of transitional groping for new strategy, it is difficult to be fair judges of the intellectual system that served the church so long and well. But if we visualize the sublime heights of the thirteenth century, and recall that still later the Protestant Reformers cast out only one doctrine of Augustinian theology, retaining the Socratic method of knowing in its entirety, we should be moved to awe and admiration. The strategy that found truth in the words of definitions formulated in the market-place of Athens was easily transferred to the words of ancient creeds or applied, as by Calvin and Luther, to the words of the Bible itself.

The very universality of this Socratic strategy in the culture of Europe and America is our chief difficulty in attempting to identify it and perceive its characteristic traits. Looking about us we find dogmatists and doctrinaires on every hand. Politicians are sure that final truth resides in a certain national constitution—by which, of course, they mean their own reading of that constitution. Other politicians find truth no less ultimate in the words of Jefferson or Jackson, or in the Manifesto of Karl Marx. Industrial magnates, like the late Andrew Carnegie or our contemporary, Henry Ford, deem themselves qualified to decide all questions for the workers in their organizations. On the other hand, labor leaders of the Gompers-Green type see no truth beyond the principles of craft unionism. Everywhere we find men assuming that things should stay put; or, if that is not possible, then they must remain fixed at the next putting. The vice-president of one of our great railroad systems, who recently allowed one of his staff to introduce basic improvements into the accounting department of that road and then vetoed further research and possible further improvements is a typical illus-

tration of a modern mind bound by the Socratic conception of truth as static and unchanging, its main features statable once and for all in definitions or policies.

All around are similar examples. In fact, they are so prevalent they are hard to see. We rarely think of the air we breathe simply because it is so common. In like manner are we normally indifferent to our own thought-processes. But when air becomes polluted, and when our habitual ways of thinking fail to convince our fellows or ourselves, it is possible that they may attract our attention. However, just as modern city dwellers frequently breathe polluted air without knowing what to do about it, we sharers of Western civilization have experienced the breakdown of our inherited method of determining truth without clearly sensing what is wrong.

When we have failed to see truth where our fathers saw it, our first impulse has been to count our fathers mistaken in their factual judgments. They have seen God where there was no God save benevolent aspects of nature figuratively presented in a noble personification. Or, they have seen reality in the ideals of democracy where there was nothing but the projection of their own dreams. We conclude that our fathers have been grossly mistaken about both God and human nature.

Then we fumble for a grip on some new truth by which to re-orient our lives. Finding it not, we drift. Our accustomed moral moorings drift with us in a universal flux where there is neither star nor compass. We have been in this slough of despond for half a century now. The World War was only one of its symptoms. Unsatisfied with inherited conclusions, we have searched frantically for new conclusions; but in our searching we cling habitually to the intellectual strategy that seeks truth in verbal formulas.

I dare say that no field has rivaled that of biblical literature as a groping ground for new conclusions. And no field provides a better illustration of traditional methods of thought carrying over to new conclusions. Careful study of biblical literature led recent scholars to relinquish the belief of the Reformers that final and infallible truth was to be found in the words of Scripture. But clinging no less tenaciously than the Reformation theologians to the Socratic conception of truth as verbal in character, these critics have dug deeper, seeking other words that might serve their need for absolute vessels. In the course of time they reported that they had been able to trace the outlines of primitive "documents" used as source material by the biblical writers. Of these documents "J," "E," "D," and "P," underlying the Pentateuch, and "Q" and "Ur-Marcus," back of the synoptic gospels, are our best-known

illustrations. Other scholars burrowed into the gospels in search of that remnant of the words of Jesus that might survive the critical pruning-shears, finally appearing with "nine sayings" of which they claimed to be certain.

Typical examples, these critical scholars, of the Socratic strategy that conceives truth as necessarily couched in verbal formulas! Losing their confidence in the words of historic creeds and canonical writings, all they could do was to look for other words. No wonder their contributions have been impotent to check the moral drift of our time, and barren of value for the problems of human life! No cause for surprise in the fact that many of our finest souls are lapsing into skepticism and despair, that personalities are disintegrating, characters breaking in demoralization! No wonder social systems totter and fall beneath the heel of dictators in Europe, South America, and even as close to our shores as Cuba!

Well indeed should Christian leaders call for new strategy. And wisely has Doctor Holt conceived the needed strategy as that which could restate Christian principles so as to convince men of their truth. Thus, at long last, we are challenged to seek not merely new conclusions, but *a new method of reaching conclusions.* It may be that our trouble has not been so much with *what* our fathers have believed about God and human nature, as *how* they justified that faith. At least, our rapid tracing of Christian history has brought into bold relief the Socratic *method* of discovering and knowing truth by its precise formulation in words. We have seen how the adoption of this method by the church led to literalism and verbalism, to the doctrinization of the gospel, and to dogmatism as the characteristic mode of ecclesiastical leadership. Hence I suggest that, in full recognition of the long endurance, the centuries of successful operation, and the noble institutional achievements of the Socratic strategy of traditional theology, we must now pass judgment on it as hopelessly antiquated. I should add, however, that as we seek a new strategy for the Christian church, we may learn much on the question of what a strategy should be from that one which has been held by the church for fifteen centuries, with fourteen centuries of efficient service to its credit.

From this we learn that the strategy requisite to our needs must come to grips with the most fundamental issues of truth and error. It must be a logic of discovering and verifying truth. It must deal frankly, intelligently, and successfully with the metaphysical issues of monotheism versus pantheism and atheism. This is required because a restatement of what it means to be a Christian must make clear the Christian's

relationship to God; and obviously this clarity cannot go hand-in-hand with cloudy thinking about God, for cloudy thinking here means either a weak or a blind faith. In a word, this strategy can be no less than a thoroughgoing philosophy that will orient men both cosmically and socially. It must do for our day what the philosophy of Plato, through his successors, principally Augustine, has done in building and guiding European and American civilization from the fourth century to the present.

In this search for a new strategy it is obvious that every seeker is free to follow whatever line may seem most promising to him. Franklin D. Roosevelt has sought to institute a "New Deal" in economics and politics. Mahatma Gandhi sees a new day for India in the freedom of the "untouchables" of that sorry land. John Dewey is exploring the region of social and political philosophy. It is natural to expect Christians to restudy the mind and teaching of Jesus and the work of his apostles, in search of the strategy that made the first two Christian centuries so dynamic and effective.

In view of our conclusion that the requisite strategy is basically philosophic in character, we should not be surprised to see minds of philosophic bent and training in the forefront of our search. This is no doubt the explanation of the prominence assumed by Professor Dewey's experimental approach to the field of morals and the social sciences. Professor Dewey has long stood as the acknowledged leader of American philosophers; and it is therefore both inevitable and wise that his suggestions of social and moral strategy should receive due consideration. His plea for a *Common Faith* that centers its attention on concrete programs of endeavor in current affairs, and which looks to the consequences of these endeavors as marks of their worth and truth, has won a large following among social scientists and Christians of naturalistic bent. But many Christians no less devoted count Mr. Dewey as the most dangerous of all foes to their cause.

Careful examination of Dewey's philosophy of instrumentalism and its experimental logic will explain both of these opposed reactions. There are two sides to every man's conclusion on every question; there are two clearly distinguishable aspects which together comprise every belief, every judgment, every philosophy. These two complementary sides are: first, the *content* or *subject-matter* of judgment; and second, the *intellectual procedure* or *logical method* by which one justifies his judgment to himself and seeks to convince others of its truth. They are, in two words, the *what* and the *how* of human thought and experience.

Now the content or "what" of Professor Dewey's common faith is simply *humanity* here and now. He centers his attention on human needs for wholesome food, sufficient clothing, comfortable and sanitary homes, jobs and fair wages, culture and happiness, freedom and democracy in the fields of industry, politics, art, and religion. In his attention to the problems confronting men in their earthly lives, he ignores all metaphysical questions. Cosmic security, which men have sought in immortality, involving belief in God as a supernatural Being who could provide cosmic basis for moral values and assurance for human aspirations that transcend the realm of physical nature, are simply omitted from Dewey's philosophy. Therefore, on the side of content, his common faith is earthly humanism linked with cosmic pantheism or atheism. It is as far from the monotheism of historic Judaism and Christianity as it could well be. It is inevitable, then, that Christians, who believe in God as the Creator and heavenly Father who appeared on earth in the fleshly person, Jesus of Nazareth, and at Golgotha, in order that he might win men to himself for time and eternity by bringing his moral example objectively within their reach as learners and doers, should find John Dewey lacking as leader, prophet, and strategist.

On the *methodological* side of his philosophy, however, we read another story. It is from this side that his thought has won the names: pragmatism, instrumentalism, experimentalism. Here Dewey challenges his fellow men to put their best conclusions into practice and learn how true or false they may be by their overt results or consequences. He is a valiant foe of the Socratic intellectual strategy that claims to find absolute truth, beyond which the further learning of men may not presume to go, in the words of accepted creeds and dogmas, whether these dogmas are political, economic, or religious. He insists that we cannot know what ways are true ways unless we have the intelligence to analyze and discern their implications and the courage requisite to put them into operation. According to his philosophy, men live by faith and achieve knowledge by intelligently reading the fruits of faith, when faith is put into practice. Faith in creeds and dogmas that produce no fruit in human uplift and enrichment of life, Dewey pronounces both dead and blind.

This brief analysis of Professor Dewey's philosophy shows why he is both praised and execrated. Those Christians who see wisdom in his teaching are the practical minds who are concerned with the *how* of the Christian message. They have learned enough about science and its accomplishments to wish for comparable efficiency of method in the Christian program. Intent on accomplishments, they seek to learn from

Dewey's experimental logic how to put Christian teachings into effect in building the kingdom of God on earth.

On the other hand, those who condemn Dewey as a destroyer are the ones who are looking at the content side of his philosophy. They have not forgotten the teaching of historic Christianity concerning cosmic reality: its conviction that God actually exists as Creator; that he is the loving Father of men and their ultimate Teacher of Truth; that his supremacy over nature makes him able to save after all the forces of physical destruction have done their worst. These Christians simply cannot reconcile the moral program of Jesus with a world view so afraid of theological implications in metaphysics that it either denies God's existence or identifies him with nature.

What aid, then, may we receive from Dewey in our efforts to achieve an effective Christian strategy meet for the twentieth century? Taking negations first, I venture to suggest that the Christian church has nothing whatever to gain from Dewey's vagueness as to *what* ultimate Reality may be. Pantheistic confusion of God with nature has little to offer in a day when the tragic needs of humanity call for a Christian strategy marked by clear thinking. Christians should not fear to compare their clear-cut monotheism with a position that loosely couples earthly humanism with a cosmology hesitating between pantheism and atheism.

But if Christians are to justify their faith in God as a Personal Ground of the cosmos itself, they must exchange the verbalistic strategy of pagan Greece for a new strategy more suited to their task. Here, that is, on the side of methodology, which is only another name for intellectual strategy, Christians may profit richly from the logical pioneering of Dewey, Here, if I am not mistaken, we shall discover Dewey to be a close, though unconfessed and unrecognized follower of Jesus. It is one of the strange confusions of our wandering between that era of world history that has been dominated by Greek forms of thought and the new era that is yet to be born, that a thinker who is farthest from Christian conceptions of Reality, should be the most Christlike in his logic: that he should be a strict follower of Jesus in his conception of *how* men may verify their ideas about reality. And it is merely another disconcerting aspect of this general confusion when we find those Christians who are surest in their conviction of the reality of God and the deity of Jesus, should be the most pagan in their logic: clinging fast to the verbalism that the Gnostics grafted into the heart of the gospel, after they had rejected as foolishness the triumphant appeal of Jesus to life and its fruits. These truest of Christians, so far as the subject-matter of the gospel is concerned, are so entangled in their fourth-century inheritance

of pagan logic that they cannot discern the extent of their apostasy from the logical method of Jesus.

It is time, therefore, for all of us to advance to the strategy of Jesus. Once we discard our Greek lenses sufficiently to free ourselves from their distorting effects, we shall see that the strategy that rendered the early church so amazingly triumphant against all odds opposing it was nothing less than a procedure of intelligently and courageously putting its faith into overt practice and leaving all questions of truth and verification to the reading of results by any and every observer. Because they accepted the simple word, "By their fruits ye shall know them," as the key principle of a complete and sufficient philosophy of life, the first Christians did not need to waste time formulating, and quarreling over creeds and dogmas. Nothing in their Hebrew background suggested such life-transcending power in words. They simply found truth in life, and let it go at that. The fact that this truth was only practical, and in no sense absolute, bothered them not at all. Sufficient unto the life of any day was the answer that its events gave to the questionings of the morning.

And if Christians of the twentieth century will consent to learn, and dare to live by, the strategy of Jesus, renouncing pagan strategy and all its trappings, they will cease quoting the *words* of creed, confessional, or Bible, as sufficient reason why any man should be a Christian. They will simply devote themselves to *living* the life of Jesus, and putting the principles of his teachings, as best they can obtain these principles from his *Laboratory Manual,* into effect for the regeneration of our whole social order and the building of the kingdom of God on earth. To them the Bible will be God's specially provided gold-mine of data for the Christian way of life, a mine whose riches can be measured only by consequences revealed in the refining fires of devoted service. Beginning with Bible data, they will be content to live by the great faith that their Master's way of life is supremely capable of speaking for itself through its own fruits; and they will expect eternal salvation for themselves only if their faith in him is from hearts that wisely love the lowliest of men, and unto righteousness in lives of daily service. The assurance and truth of Christianity they will seek in the happy smiles of boys and girls whose sufferings from malnutrition have been overcome by Christian neighborliness. When doubters scoff, they will point to the clear and steady eyes of men and women from which fear and dread have flown. To all skeptics, they will reply, "Come and see!"

THE MADRAS CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE
Yale Divinity School

The Madras meeting of the International Missionary Council registered a significant stage in the development of the world-wide Christian fellowship. It met for seventeen days during the closing weeks of 1938. The place of meeting was the spacious new plant of the Madras Christian College at Tambaram, a suburb of Madras. The delegates were given dormitory accommodations in the halls of the college, they ate together in the three separate residential units, and they used the big auditorium for their plenary sessions and their corporate worship. This made for an intimacy of fellowship which was one of the most striking achievements of the gathering.

The Conference was the most widely representative of any ever held by Protestant Christianity. The group was limited to about four hundred and seventy-five. This was necessary if the gathering were to be a conference rather than a convention and if it were not to overflow the buildings of the college. These four hundred and seventy-five delegates came from seventy different countries. They were there from several of the countries of Latin America, from a number of the lands and peoples of Africa, from the Islands of the Pacific, and from the Netherlands Indies. Indeed, never before have such large delegations gone from any of these regions to a Protestant international gathering. There were large delegations from India, China, Japan, Burma, and the Philippines. The Continent of Europe was well represented and it was significant and encouraging that Germans were permitted by their government to attend. This they were not allowed to do at the ecumenical gatherings at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937. Great Britain and North America had, as was natural, large groups.

The theme of the Conference was The Church. That meant especially the so-called "younger" churches—those bodies which have arisen as a result of Protestant missions of the past two centuries. This was because of the conviction that increasingly the burden of the propagation of the Christian faith in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the islands of the Pacific must rest upon the churches in these lands rather than, as so largely in the past, upon the "older" churches of the Occident. For this reason, moreover, the delegations from the "younger" churches

constituted a larger proportion of the Madras meeting than has been true of any previous world-wide Christian gathering. They totaled approximately half of the Conference. In no other assembly of any kind so world-wide in its scope have the peoples of Asia, Africa and the Pacific Islands had so large a voice as at Madras.

In stressing the Church the organizers of the Conference had no thought of making the Church an end in itself. That way would lie sterility. The Church was emphasized, rather, as an instrument for giving witness to the Christian faith to all mankind and as a means toward the transformation of all human society. To be sure, some of the delegates, notably those from Germany, would have denied any purpose of changing all human society. That, to their minds, is opposed to the plain teaching of the New Testament. To them the Christian ethic is for an *ad interim* purpose, and the Church is simply to bear its witness between the times and until Christ comes in glory by a sudden act of divine power to set up his Kingdom. However, with that view the large majority of the delegates did not agree. They believed that the Church should work for the remaking of society according to the pattern of the Sermon on the Mount.

Much, too, was made of evangelism and of the duty of the Church to transmit the Christian gospel to all men.

The organization of the Conference was designed to facilitate discussion and planning. In a certain sense the gathering constituted a central planning board for the formulation of the next steps ahead for the world program of Protestant Christianity, particularly in the lands of the younger churches. The Conference was, accordingly, a working body. It did not assemble to hear great addresses or even primarily for joint worship.

To fulfil this aim the Conference was divided into sixteen sections. Each of these sections met daily for approximately two sessions of an hour and a half each for a week. In each, findings were formulated by a smaller drafting committee and these findings were again referred to the section for criticism and suggestion to be sure that, so far as possible, they embodied the mind of the group. Every report was submitted, in turn, to the entire Conference for discussion and was modified to take advantage of suggestions from the floor.

In addition to the groups planned in advance by the officers, special ones assembled to discuss topics of interest to certain of the delegates. These, too, formulated findings which in turn were brought to the entire assembly. For these latter, however, discussion by the Conference was precluded by the shortness of the time.

The findings of all the groups are to be published in one volume, and before this article can appear will have been made available to the public.

Every morning the Conference met together for corporate worship, and on each of the two Sundays a corporate communion service was held for all the delegates. One of the communion services was according to the forms of the Church of England and the other according to the tradition of the so-called free churches.

Several evenings were given to addresses, but these, as we have suggested, were not the prominent features of the gathering.

Wherein lies the significance of the Madras meeting?

First of all it lies in part in the printed findings. These are of unequal quality. Some are clearly mediocre. Others are noteworthy. Together they embody most of the more progressive missionary thinking of the past decade. In some respects they break new ground. Outstanding are the ones on Christian literature and on theological education, but some of the others are also distinctly above the average. They must not be taken as the final word on any subject. The time allowed for their formulation was too brief to permit any one of them to be epoch-making. The Conference, too, had to divide its energies over too many topics—each of them urgent—to allow it to devote its entire attention to any one or two subjects. On the topics with which they deal the findings do, however, represent the present stage of thinking of a cross section of the better minds of the leadership of Protestant Christianity. They display both the strength and the weakness of current Protestantism.

The findings are placed first because, although significant, they are probably the least important of the outstanding features of Madras. It would be a mistake to concentrate one's attention on them or to condemn or approve the Conference on the basis of what they said or left unsaid.

In the second place, and more important, Madras is significant because of the stimulus of mind which it gave to the leadership of Protestant Christendom. Mind rubbed against mind. Ideas were transmitted and new ones were evoked. It is doubtful whether any delegate went away entirely unchanged by the experience. It is fair to expect that in the years ahead movements will appear which were not planned or even foreshadowed in the official findings, but which will have had their inception in the fructifying of the minds of the delegates by their contacts with one another. Just as one of the unexpected developments of the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh, in 1910, was the Conference on Faith and Order which in turn has been one of the two chief sources of the World Council of Churches, so almost certainly some of the most

important results of Madras will be those which cannot now be predicted and are not planned for in the documents which were so laboriously produced.

The third of the significant features of the Madras meeting was the revelation which it gave of the degree to which the "younger" churches have come of age. It was not just the fact that the delegates of the younger churches were in the slight majority. That was in part the result of deliberate planning and was to that extent artificial. The maturity of the younger churches was seen, rather, in the rôle which their leaders took in the discussions. In ability, insight, and poise they proved themselves quite the equals of the leaders of the older churches. There was no sense of patronage of the delegates of the younger by the delegates of the older churches. Nor was there any self-imposed restraint of the spokesmen of the older churches to allow leeway to the younger churches. There was almost no resentment shown by younger churches against domination, fancied or real, by the missionary and the older churches. In contrast with these attitudes, which have been so marked in some earlier regional and international Christian gatherings, the representatives of the younger churches took their places naturally and without restraint or self-consciousness as fully the equals of the delegates from the older churches. They spoke their minds freely and well. Their views were listened to with respect because in themselves these views clearly deserved it. When criticism was felt to be necessary that criticism was voiced and was received in the same fine spirit in which it was given. So, too, views put forward by those from the older churches were taken for what they were worth and stood on their own merits without prestige accorded to their Western origin or without disparagement because of that provenance. It seemed at times as though the distinctions between older and younger churches had ceased to be. Here was a world-wide Christian fellowship dealing with the problems of the world, and with very little sense of any demarcation between younger and older members of the Christian family.

The fourth and most important feature of the Madras gathering was the advance which was registered toward the realization of a world-wide Christian fellowship. More than once in the past few years discerning observers have commented on the fact that in a day when the rifts between nations have been widening and deepening the churches of the world are drawing together. This is a movement which is not born of fear of war. It was under way before 1914. It has had a steady and a healthy growth. Undoubtedly a consciousness of the parlous state of the world has speeded up the development, but here is nothing spas-

modic or transient. More than any other gathering Madras gave tangible form to this process and by doing so hastened it. The Jerusalem meeting of 1928 was much smaller, and in it the older churches were still dominant. The Oxford and Edinburgh gatherings of 1937 were composed overwhelmingly of members of the churches of Europe and North America and dealt chiefly with the Occidental aspects of current problems. At Madras world-wide Protestantism was for the first time inclusively present. While in proportion of their numerical strength the younger churches were better represented than were the older churches, about half the Conference was made up of spokesmen from the latter. There was much talk, and properly so, of closer cooperation. Some of the members of the younger churches went even further and came out vigorously for organic union—although they did not closely define that somewhat vague term. However, at Madras the awareness grew of a fellowship which transcends organizations and which must underlie any formal, visible unity if that unity is to be more than a name. The only true Christian unity is one of love. Repeatedly organizational unity or creedal uniformity has been unable to prevent deep chasms of distrust and hate from separating Christians. While inevitably unity of spirit will eventuate in some kind of organizational expression, to seek to obtain the former by means of the latter is to ignore the basic issues and to threaten with disaster the movement to achieve true unity. It was the chief glory of Madras that it placed fellowship first. In this some of us believe that we see something new in Christian history. We seem to be living in one of the great days of the Christian Church, when in a deeper and in a more Christian fashion than ever before Christian people are coming together and are realizing that in their common faith and their common experience is that which transcends differences in ecclesiastical forms while it still allows them.

While Madras marked real advances, it left much to be achieved. This word-wide Christian fellowship has still to discover ways of making its weight count adequately in meeting some of the most urgent problems of our age. Thus far Christianity has had a tremendous influence upon individual nations and peoples in both East and West. In the present century Christian missions have profoundly moved whole nations in the Orient. Upon education, medicine, the status of women, and political and social ideals in such nations as China and India as well as upon less numerous folk Christianity has placed a deep stamp. In days when these cultures were fluid and open to currents from the Occident Christianity entered and became a part of the warp and woof of these peoples. Its influence has been all out of proportion to the numerical strength of the

younger churches. Today, however, the most burning questions are ones of achieving a just economic structure and an international order which will insure both peace and justice. It is sobering and thought-provoking that one of the least satisfactory of the Madras reports was the one having to do with the Church and the international situation. The world-wide Christian fellowship has yet to learn how to implement its longings for peace.

To be sure, even in the international sphere the Church has by no means entirely failed. Out of it have come the creators of international law and the initiators of most of the peace organizations and movements. Through its world-wide spread Christianity is beginning to undergird world society with a common body of generally acknowledged ethical ideals—ideals which must be accepted and put into practice if international chaos is to give place to international order. Individual Christians and small groups of Christians have mediated between warring peoples, have spread a sympathetic appreciation of one people by another, and have alleviated some of the sufferings of war.

Yet this is not enough. Now that the world-wide Christian fellowship is becoming a reality there is an opportunity to do something more. None of us sees clearly just what this something more can be. Probably it is not one thing but many. It is encouraging that at Madras a suggestion was made looking toward the more effective cooperation of Christian bodies about the Pacific Basin for the peaceful solution of the problems of that area. We must, however, have still further thought and experimentation before we find the way.

It is a hopeful sign that Madras did not profess to formulate final solutions to the problems which confront the Church. It recognized itself to be only a step—although an important step—in a process. The significance of the Conference cannot yet be accurately appraised. It has still to be determined. Whether Madras is really successful depends upon how wisely and faithfully Christians the world over pursue some of the leads which were given at Madras and continue to work for the solution of problems which Madras discussed. This is not the obligation simply of those who journeyed to and from India. It rests as well upon Christians the world around.

YOUTH AND THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

JOHN SCOTT EVERTON

First Baptist Church, Wayne, Pa.

THERE can be no question of greater concern to mature Christians than the attitude of the oncoming generation of youth toward the Christian Community. For upon their attitude depends the expansion and growth of the Christian Community, if not its continued existence. A steady decline of young people in the church and church school, with the shifting of their interests and loyalties to secular programs, sharpens the problem that is faced by Christendom. If we lose youth then the institutionalized church as we know it today is doomed. This is one of the most serious problems that faces the church today. How can the church maintain the support and interest of its youth? This study does not propose the solution, but seeks to understand the attitude of youth toward the Christian Community, for without understanding there can be no solution. These observations of youth are based primarily on ten years' association with them in universities and colleges. The findings of this study deal largely with the reactions of student youth, but many of the attitudes expressed are characteristic not only of students but of other youth.

To understand the relationship between youth and the Christian Community it is necessary to define the term "Christian Community." In a sense there is no such thing as a Christian Community except as an ideal not yet fully realized in any area of life. In this sense Christian Community is identified with the idea of the kingdom of God as a future hope rather than a present reality. In another sense the Christian Community is existent in the world today. The term is used in the Preparatory Study for the World Conference of Christian Youth, as "the God-given supra-national body to which has been entrusted the message of the victory of Jesus Christ over the world's spiritual, political, and social confusion." There is a tendency in this instance to identify the Christian Community with the Œcumenical Church. This includes, according to The Findings of the Conference on Faith and Order, "all who are 'in Christ' knit together in one fellowship through the Holy Spirit." This Œcumenical Church is the household of God, the family in which the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is realized in the children of his adoption. While youth might not express their conception of the Christian Community in quite these theological terms, if they understand it at all, it is as a community that will transcend social, political, and racial

barriers, and unite all mankind in common communion with God through Jesus Christ.

In a report from the National Student Federation Conference held in New Mexico, religion, student government, and peace were described as the three major concerns of the Federation for the new year. While this report may be hailed as evidence of genuine interest in religion on the part of student leaders, it is necessary to qualify what is meant here by religion. In this report of the Federation religion is approached primarily as a philosophy for life rather than from any doctrinal or theological basis. It can scarcely be maintained that conventional religion in its more stereotyped forms appeals to American students. Students are tremendously interested in the meaning of religion for personal life and ethical conduct, but they are not especially concerned with a theological interpretation based on what seems to them to be archaic theological forms and dogma. In this respect American students differ somewhat from English students, and from some European student groups, where more emphasis is placed on theology. An outstanding leader of American student thought has stated recently that there never was a time when students were more earnest in their quest for an adequate religious basis for life, nor a time when students evinced a greater ignorance of the fundamental truths of great religion. The responsibility for this ignorance rests largely upon the homes and local religious institutions from which they have come. An inadequate interpretation of religion there has given them nothing on which to build when they have broken away from old associations.

The religious interest of students cannot be judged by the number of members in Christian Associations or the attendance at chapel services, for only too often, even though they have a definite religious interest, they avoid these organized forms of religion. If we were to judge solely by the external facts we would have to acknowledge that students are indifferent to religion, but may it not be that sometimes they are indifferent to the form it takes and the platitudinous phrases it uses, when actually there is a genuine desire to know God and to understand their relationship to Him and to their fellows? In one of the largest State universities, during a special religious emphasis week, a meeting was arranged for the members of the engineering school. It was well advertised as a religious meeting. Out of twenty-five hundred engineering students only two put in an appearance. Yet in that same university when the minister of a community church gave a series of lectures on "The Home and Marriage," it was difficult to find a hall large enough to take care of the students who attended, many of them from this same engineering school,

students who had shown almost complete indifference to the earlier "religious" meeting. These lectures were given by a Christian minister from a Christian point of view and found immediate response. In a sense they were as much "religious" meetings as the earlier meeting, but they didn't bear the stigma attached to that name, and they did deal with problems of vital personal interest. In another leading university, with a student body of several thousand, the average attendance at chapel service is between fifteen and twenty, yet when an outstanding peace advocate was announced there were over a thousand students to hear him. In a student group belonging to a university church, such subjects as "Finding Outlets for Leisure Time," "Peace," "Race Relations," and "Appreciation of Music," found more ready response than those topics definitely tagged with a "religious" title. Students are genuinely concerned with the essence of religion but they are somewhat suspicious of labels and outward forms that suggest too close association with traditional religious expression. Unless religion is willing to face squarely the major personal and social problems now confronting youth, and to say something constructive concerning them, it will be a dead issue so far as students are concerned.

The attitude of youth to the Christian Community may be determined in part by their attitude to the imperfect segments of this world fellowship which exist in denominations, sects, and local churches. Some indication has already been given of the student attitude toward "institutionalized" religion, but to appreciate the problem fully it is necessary to be more specific. The youth of today are not interested in the cramping limits of denominationalism. They are more seriously concerned with the rising œcumenical tide within the churches. Student groups do not look with much sympathy on denominational exclusiveness, and the matters which divide denominations do not impress them as of major importance. The great student Christian movements are not denominational but œcumenical. There is a fundamental contradiction between the church as the body of Christ, the universal fellowship of those who have committed their lives to God in Christ, and the many sectarian divisions which now exist. In a Study Outline in preparation for the World Conference of Christian Youth at Amsterdam this problem is made a matter for study and discussion. The divisions into which the church is unhappily divided become "authorities other than God" as soon as they are defended for their own sakes, as soon as they are "enough." Young people are asking why there should be divisions in the Christian church, and what is the Christian church? The denominational approach does not challenge the youth of today, and rigid exclusiveness may be a means

of keeping them apart entirely from the local church. A divided church is no great attraction to young people who are looking for fellowship, nor is it consistent with what they understand to be the spirit of Christ. As one youth leader has put it, "the church is the fellowship of Christians who say there is one God, even the universal Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and then proceed to deny his oneness by their many divisions." That the realization of the "Communion of the Saints" will always be at best imperfect on this earth, goes without saying, but if the church is to attract and challenge youth then there must exist a far greater degree of "communion" than has existed in the past.

Aside from the question of denominational cooperation there are other aspects of institutionalized religion toward which youth is critical, and which account for much of the growing indifference of youth in the local church. Conditions are such within the church that it is difficult for youth to feel at home in it. The church as a whole does not speak the language of youth. Generally speaking young people are as estranged from the church as is labor, though for somewhat different reasons. A primary reason for this indifference of youth is found in the content of much of the preaching of the church. The old-fashioned doctrinal preaching misses the mark. Authority cannot compel people to drink even the water of life. Something more than hortatory remarks, platitudinous in form and in phrasing is needed if the church is to be the spiritual leader of youth. Intellectual laziness in the pulpit may satisfy the elders, but youth is quick to detect it. Simply mouthing the old phrases will not keep youth in the church. If the preacher fails to speak in terms that are understood by the younger Christians they will turn away from the church. But better preaching and a better trained ministry, important though it is, will not in itself solve the problem of youth indifferent to organized religion. The President of Yale University, in his report for last year, notes that with the exception of a few special services "undergraduate attendance at religious services is slight," though "nowhere can better preaching be heard."

More fundamental than the criticism of the preaching ministry is the charge that the church is primarily a conservative institution, both theologically and socially. It has sometimes been so preoccupied with defending doctrinal questions that it has had little time or energy to deal with the practical problems that confront youth. While thoughtful young people realize that these doctrinal forms have been expressions in times past of genuine religious experience, they are somewhat impatient when it is insisted that they must limit their own experience of religion to this static form expressed by the church fathers. The dogmatism of such an

approach does not appeal to the scientific temper of modern youth. They are more interested in a pragmatic approach which lives, not by the authority of ancient doctrine, but by contemporary experience, and through such experience validates the great truths of religion. Young people are attracted by the social idealism in the Sermon on the Mount and in Jesus' teaching concerning the Kingdom, but they soon discover that the church, because its outlook tends to conform to the outlook of those on whom it counts for support, is more interested in maintaining the status quo. As one youth leader put it rather cynically: "You don't have to attend the worship service Sunday morning to know what the preacher's message is going to be. The wheel-base of the automobiles outside the church building will usually suggest the main emphasis of the preaching of the pure word of God." Youth discover the conservative nature of the church when they seek to apply the ethical ideals of Jesus to society, for social radicals are frowned upon in the church, despite the revolutionary ideals of its founder. Students who are at all socially minded observe that too often the church merely talks about religious values without doing anything to implement them in society. Many are not satisfied with the witness of the church to "service." The church engages in social service it is true, but only rarely does it stand and work for basic justice. The administration of palliatives is not true service. Three graduate students, desiring to invest their lives in a project to bring the social ideals of Jesus into an area of industrial conflict and exploitation, sought support from church leaders. They discovered that, almost without exception, those church leaders who had been most outspoken concerning the social gospel refused to risk any of their material means in a genuine Christian social experiment. It was a disillusioning experience and revealed that too often the church is not willing to go beyond theory to the practice of the ethical ideals it proclaims so loudly. If youth cannot find adequate expression and outlet for their social idealism through the church they will turn elsewhere as countless numbers have already done.

But it is not only youth who are socially radical who are leaving the church today. Of those who are interested in religion, the social radicals, even among youth, constitute a minority. For many the important thing is not that the church give them channels through which to exercise their social idealism, but rather that the church give them a constructive philosophy by which to live. Nurtured more or less by churches suffering from spiritual anemia, they are struck by the impotence of the church to supply a definite sense of direction and goals toward which they may move. Too frequently the message of the church has either been so

other-worldly that it has borne no relation to the problems of this world, or it has dealt with topics that have little pertinence to the day-by-day problems of youth. The philosophy of life for which youth seek is a set of ideas plus attitudes which define the chief motives of life and give them some direction.

While young people have been indifferent to much that the church has to offer there are at present signs of religious awakening, and youth might be drawn to more whole-hearted support should the church program be adapted to meet the needs of youth. What then does youth expect and need in the church? Certainly it is not simply a program of practical action that will prove satisfying. Michael Bruce, in describing the church in China, speaks of a lack in the pragmatic approach that is quite as real here as in the Orient. "The liberal Social Gospel outlook is quite unable to meet the real needs of the educated Christian in China. It has grown largely out of the reaction to what was false and inadequate in the individualistic view-point, but in the realm of thought and theology it has only to the smallest extent become a creative movement of its own. The riches of the great theological and philosophical life of the church are as closed to the advocates of the social gospel as they were to those of the individual gospel." Neither the old individualistic approach nor the more recent social approach will suffice, for each represents only a half-truth. The gospel is neither exclusively individualistic nor is it entirely social. It is for the whole of life and must redeem not only one segment but all of life. Neither extremist approach will ultimately satisfy the desires of thoughtful youth. While there will always be a demand on the part of youth for idealism in practical service, this is not the major need of the hour.

Attention has been drawn to the fact that there never was a time when students were more earnest in the quest for an adequate religious basis for life. At a recent student conference the discussion group that attracted the greatest number of students was a study group in New Testament. The outcome of that experience was a resolution urging that the Bible be given a more central place in the curriculum of schools and colleges. In a leading graduate school of religion there has been a more marked seriousness on the part of the students that has led them to gather in informal discussion and prayer groups, seeking to deepen their understanding of religion in life. Youth is open to the message of the church as not for years, if the church will adapt its message to their wistful quest for religious understanding. Along with this greater earnestness in the religious quest we need to remember that there is also a greater ignorance of fundamental religious truths, and youth need a

reasonable interpretation of the great facts of Christianity. The unique message of the church for youth is not contained in some enlightening lecture on some current topic any more than it is contained in a theology that is altogether other-worldy and not relevant to modern life. Youth wants to know about the existence of God, and man's relation to God, about the meaning of prayer, about the person of Jesus, his ethical teaching and the meaning of his mission for the world. Youth would like to know what adequate basis Christianity offers for a philosophy of life and what the motivating points are for Christian conduct.

Since the home or the school does not furnish youth with the simple disciplines of the spiritual life, the church must give some indication of the ways in which the powers of the spiritual life may be apprehended. Training in spiritual discipline may be found in the experience of group worship, as well as in private devotion. One of the most impressive experiences at the Eagles Mere Conference last year was the morning service of devotion conducted entirely by students. There seemed to be a genuine desire to realize an awareness of the presence of God through praise, the spoken word, and moments of quiet meditation. The students were unusually appreciative of that hour and revealed a deep longing for meaningful devotion and spiritual discipline. In a western university the religious service which had the most general appeal to students was a service in which worship was entirely through music and meditation with no spoken word. Our services in Protestant churches have not always been conducive to a realization of the presence of God, nor have they been worthy spiritual discipline that has resulted in inspiration and strength to meet the needs of daily life.

A distinctive service the church can render youth is to face the problems that belong peculiarly to youth and give them a Christian perspective from which to face these problems. Problems relating to the choice of a vocation, the all-important choice of a mate, the establishment of a home, the responsibility of youth to the community, and the attitude youth should take toward such questions as industrial conflict, unemployment, racial differences, the use of force in international dispute, all need to be approached from a Christian point of view with some suggestion of what light Christianity throws on their solution. Youth are not as inclined to accept easy answers to these problems of human conduct, as they were a few years ago. They are not so sure that Utopia can be achieved through scientific control or political manipulation. They are realizing that there is no easy solution to the tensions set up in modern life. A new spirit is abroad, a spirit born of disillusion. They are questioning the basic assumptions underlying the various programs

offered for the ills of society. They are open to conviction, and the church, if it is adequate, must assist in this examination of basic assumptions and provide a Christian perspective by which to evaluate them. If we believe that the way of Christ is the way of truth, then we should make that way plain to youth through the message of the church—not as a blue-print by which to order life, but as guiding principles governing all conduct, standards by which to judge the right or wrong way of doing things, a spirit or attitude by which to live.

If the church is to attract youth it must develop techniques for unselfish service that will give youth an opportunity to test the validity of the Christian ethic in practical experience. Students are not attracted by a religion which remains in the realm of theory. The church must be willing to pioneer in new forms of service, giving youth an opportunity for adventurous vocations and avocations in the field of socialized religion. Thus far the Quakers have been the only major religious body to experiment in taking Christian ideals into areas of tension and conflict. Other churches have cooperated through the Federal Council but there has been little independent effort. Religion, if it is to appeal to youth, must express itself serving particular areas of need, not simply through financial support, but through active participation in creative enterprises. Despite the fact that there are large numbers of students who seem immune to social ills, there is an increasing desire on the part of students to understand and relieve conditions of basic need. Many students are spending their holidays working among the underprivileged in an effort to alleviate their suffering, and discover the causes which allow such conditions to exist. In the work camps of the American Friends Service Committee we have an illustration of this growing concern. Students work through the day with the people in a community in a conflict or underprivileged area. At night they study the problems which have confronted them in their work and seek to discover ways of non-violence in social conflict. Frequent periods are given to the discovery of spiritual resources for reconciliatory activity. Students pay for the privilege of such work in these areas. It is true that the focus of interest is often primarily social, economic, or political, but the work has a Christian basis, and many of the students are driven to undertake it by the desire to test their Christian ideals in action. There are many troubled areas in our national life today where the church could make a genuine contribution by pioneering in translating our Christian ideals into action. The church, if it would appeal to youth, needs to venture fearlessly into new forms of endeavor for making the riches of its gospel available to those who most need its help.

Young people soon discover that the idealist travels a lonely road, and to help alleviate their loneliness they expect the church to be to them a fellowship. They are not looking primarily for a social fellowship, for congenial groups of that sort may be found without the church. What they are seeking for is a spiritual fellowship in which the members feel a true sense of kinship to each other through worship, religious understanding, and unselfish service. This must not be an exclusive fellowship within narrow denominational lines, but a fellowship akin to that which is found in the world Christian Community, a fellowship which is a definite part of that larger family, transcending all barriers of race and nation, uniting all men in Christ who have committed their lives to the God Christ revealed to the world. There never was a greater opportunity than there is today for the church to offer creative leadership to lead youth out of its confusion into a world Christian Community which unites all men in the love of God in Christ.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CONTEMPORARY CHRIST. Richard Roberts. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. x, 148. $2.00.

RUFUS M. JONES is the editor and author of the first volume of the new "Great Issues of Life" series. His introduction to this, the second volume of the series, states, "This book, I find, gives us an admirable treatment of community in its broadest sense—our mutual and reciprocal relations with God, and our *koinónia,* or fellowship relations with each other in those intimate matters which most deeply concern the human soul." (p. vii.)

Here is the main emphasis: the sense of communion, as opposed to the individualism and sectarianism of traditional Protestantism. This fellowship is the beginning of worship and prayer, and, indeed, of the whole Christian fabric of the soul's life.

Two other positions of the writer are evident. First, the primacy of God's search for man and the latter's increasing sense of the "given." Second, the everywhere-apparent tendency today to return to the firm and assured assertions that conserve the values of liberalism and liberalize the truths of conservatism.

The easy reading of the book may betray us into missing the importance of its implications.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON.

REASON AND REVELATION IN THE MIDDLE AGES. Etienne Gilson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. Pp. 114. $1.50.

THIS book, which contains the Richards Lectures delivered at the University of Virginia in 1937, will be of interest to the student of present theological and philosophical trends on the continent of Europe. The author is an erudite expert on the philosophies current in what are denominated the Dark Ages. To him they are less dark than usually painted. And he writes in an easy and limpid style. The direction of his thought is indicated by the chapter titles, The Primacy of Faith, The Primacy of Reason, and The Harmony of Reason and Revelation. There is thus an apparent effort to give direction to present-day thinkers. For the Middle Age philosophers were influenced by those who went before them and, in turn, are influencing those who come after. In the years when faith in revelation was primary the outstanding figures are Tertullian and Augustine. To the first, revelation was all and reason nothing. To the second, faith was fundamental, but the content of revelation might be understood by reason using logic as its unfailing guide. The leader in the reaction which would make reason first an issue in natural theology was the Arab, Avoroees, whose writings, although directed against the Koran, did influence Christian thought. Here we have an absolute separation between reason and revelation, when Thomas Aquinas enters the picture and the lecturer discusses him as the great harmonizer. The position of Professor Gilson is clearly set forth in the concluding words of the final lecture, "If . . . we learn from individual theologians what is faith in an objective truth and what is an objective philosophical knowledge, we shall find ourselves possessed of both a Revelation and a Reason. Then here will be something to harmonize, and anyone attempting to do it will end at last in meeting the real problem. But he can scarcely

avoid meeting Saint Thomas Aquinas." Thus one discovers that the author belongs, as he claims that other thinker, Jacques Maritain, does, to the "Thomas family."

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH.

THE GROWTH OF RELIGION. Henry Nelson Wieman and Walter Marshall Horton. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. xviii, 505. $5.00.

ALTHOUGH these two brilliant American scholars have bound their work into one volume, they might just as well have published separately the two treatises which comprise this book. They can stand independently without any feeling of divorcement. The one is a study in the historical unfoldment of religion; the second an attempt to construct a valid philosophy of religion. It is difficult to see how the one work is indispensable to the other or why they were bound into one volume. Moreover, each author assumes no responsibility for the point of view of the other.

Doctor Horton writes the first 205 pages under the title, "The Historical Growth of Religion." In it he traces the growth of religion from its origin among primitive peoples through its developments in India, China, and Japan; in Parsiism, Judaism, and Islam; through its high expression in Christianity; to its modern expressions in radical secularism in nationalism, communism, and fascism. Out of this excellent, rapid survey of religions past and present, Doctor Horton brings the following statement of the nature of religion in the light of its history: "The purpose and goal of high religion may be defined as *the progressive reorganization of the world into a system of mutually sustaining activities humanly appreciated, whereby the endless growth of meaning and value is fostered.* Its God is the *Being whereon the accomplishment of this aim ultimately depends.*"

Doctor Wieman writes the last half of the volume under the general title, "Contemporary Growth of Religion." His endeavor throughout is, through an analysis of the dominant philosophies of religion, to establish the validity and desirability of the particular school to which he adheres. He finds five general philosophies of religion which have followings today: liberalism; traditional supernaturalism; humanism; the new supernaturalism; theistic naturalism. The last two schools receive the most consideration.

Doctor Wieman is an adherent of the last-named school. Its tools in approaching religion are reason and the empirical method. God can be known. He is not the "Absolutely Other" of the new supernaturalism. Through the activities of life, as we are obedient to that which causes life to grow and unfold in beauty, we shall be given "whatever knowledge we can ever have of God and of the way to God." God is found, in other words, in the operational aspects of life. This spells the rejection of all speculative approaches to deity.

The heart of Doctor Wieman's philosophy of religion is found in two expressions: "connections of mutual support"; "connections of mutual control." Man is made for unlimited growth and for the control of his individual and social environment. As he gives himself increasingly to that growth which makes for connections of mutual support and control, he not only finds God, but also helps to build that genuine interrelatedness and community which are the only hopes of saving the race from blackest catastrophe.

This volume, especially the second half by Doctor Wieman, is certain to provoke considerable discussion. It offers a new approach to religious reality. Setting aside the supernaturalism of the supernaturalists, the "religious experience" of the

liberals, and the imaginative God of the humanists, it asserts that God is to be found "progressively by intelligent action and sensitivity of response in each concrete situation." It thus offers a God who is here and now, always awaiting apprehension by sensitive souls.

GEORGE W. DAVIS.

THE RISE OF PURITANISM. William Haller. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 464. $4.50.

IT IS becoming increasingly clear that not alone American history but American institutions as well, whether civil or religious, can be understood only as their English origins are known and understood. Recently many volumes have appeared to show the steady development in America of a culture stemming from old English planting. If there be need for change, transplanting or uprooting we need to know the soil and seed and fiber of the plant with which we have to do.

Professor Haller has made a welcome and most impressive contribution toward that end. He has helped us to see the England of the late sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, with the social revolution slowly working out its course and the innumerable panaceas offered as remedies for the evils. Most insistent and most certain was the voice of the Puritan firmly convinced he possessed all requisite knowledge to create a good world in the written word of God.

The glorious ideal and the passionate faith in its possible achievement is well presented by the author through extensive quotations from writers and preachers and an interpretation of the unquenchable spirit animating all. It was an age of crisis, when all the values of human living might be lost or won. Individual rights and privileges, freedom of thought and speech and conduct were set on their way in a new democracy secured by profound thought, resolute will and heroic action. Men lived and died for these things both in England and America. As Walter Lippmann asks: Have we lost the knowledge and the will by which these values can be saved?

Puritanism, we find by this book, was a mighty oak planted three hundred years ago. Shall we let it die?

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

ORIGINS OF THE GOSPELS. Floyd V. Filson. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1938. Pp. 216. $2.00.

HERE is a book that rings the bell. Professor Filson has not been concerned to extend horizons of knowledge or to rearrange findings to form a new pattern. His purpose was a far more homely one: "This book is written out of a conviction that a chief responsibility of those who deal constantly with the technical side of gospel study is to offer from time to time a plain statement of the trends of such a study" (p. 25). He hits the bull's-eye fairly and squarely. Ministers often feel, if they don't complain, that much of the technical work of scholarship is poles apart from their preaching. In a way this is a comfortable feeling, for thereby they excuse themselves from trying to grapple with it. A good many homiletic sins have been committed under the inspiration of "you can't preach that stuff." Now in the most gentle and understanding way Professor Filson has debunked that attitude. This volume is intended for parish ministers. It presupposes very little depth of knowledge, but it does not talk down. The compass of the various problems affecting gospel study is systematically (and interestingly) boxed. After a good

survey of the discoveries and resulting changes in the field of textual criticism he turns to the live topic of the language in which the gospels were written. Is Torrey right? Were the gospels written in Aramaic? Form criticism next engages him, and he gives an exceedingly able and untechnical description and evaluation of this important departure. From form criticism he turns to the study of the written gospels, first the Synoptists, then John.

Occasionally he expresses his own competent opinion; more generally he contents himself with giving a strictly fair presentation of that phenomenon generally known as the "consensus of competent opinion." So much the better. But the minister who desires to catch up will find this volume an eye-opener. Regularly the chapters close with such sections as "The Minister and Textual Criticism," "Practical Implications," "The Preacher and Source Hypotheses." It will be a curious sort of preacher who can read this book with real attention without distinct and visible profit. Many churches, if they only knew what it would do for them, would divert two dollars from some fund or other and purchase a copy for their preachers. There are no ready-made sermons in the volume, but there is a well of sweet water which should make some arid sermon-patches begin to send up new shoots.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

THE BOND OF HONOR. Burton Scott Easton and Howard C. Robbins. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. 112. $1.50.

WITH the passage of a new law in Maryland, the racket of the marrying parsons in Elkton, Md., has been interrupted. But Elkton is not the only town in America where ministers act as accomplices to hasty marriages. If all ministers were required to read this little hand-book on marriage before they were ordained, the government would not need to pass laws to curb their irresponsible activities. Professors Easton and Robbins have produced a hand-book for the use of ministers in the instruction of couples who come to them for marriage in which the marriage service of the Episcopal Church is explained clause by clause, and the history of the development of the service is also given. The non-episcopal churches and their ministers will be well-advised to reconsider their wedding practices in the light of this deeply Christian understanding of the significance of the ceremony. There is nothing sectarian about this book. In the appendix the Lutheran and Presbyterian marriage services are given as well as the Episcopalian and the introduction to the book is written by Doctor Buttrick, the well-known Presbyterian minister.

GORDON POTEAT.

THE SPIRIT OF VOLTAIRE. Norman L. Torrey. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. xiii, 314. $3.00.

THIS work, by a Professor of French in Columbia University, like that on the famous Frenchman by the poet, Alfred Noyes, aims at placing its subject in a more favorable light than has been the custom hitherto. But the Columbia professor will not suffer at the hands of the Roman Catholic censor as did the British poet. Patient research has gone into the gathering of materials out of which the author has distilled the spirit of the philosopher. It is apparent that he was a man of his times, although constantly tilting his lance at all authorities whether of church or state. The passion for freedom of thought dominated the man. In spite of some

repetitions, the reader is carried smoothly through the various stages of Voltaire's life. His libertinism was that of the age just before the outbreak of the French Revolution. His emotional temperament is clearly delineated. Pride and prejudice are discovered as moving forces in his activities. His years of despotic leadership in the colony near Geneva are outlined and there is an interesting chapter on the character of his friends. The final chapter aims to show that his Deism was compounded of mysticism and humanism, with the latter playing the principal part. One reads the book with interest, but raises a dissenting question about the conclusion of the author that we are now in a period of increasing fanaticism when the generations will again turn to the spirit of Voltaire.

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH.

BEYOND HUMANISM. Charles Hartshorne. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 324. $2.50.

REVELATION AND RESPONSE. Edgar P. Dickie. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. Pp. 278. $2.50.

PROFESSOR HARTSHORNE, of the department of philosophy of the University of Chicago, gives in this volume a penetrating criticism of nontheistic humanism. It is a criticism based upon a real and sympathetic understanding of that which is criticized, genuinely philosophical in temper, and therefore calculated to set forward comprehension of truth rather than induce futile controversy. The inadequacy of nontheistic humanism, ethically and socially as well as philosophically, is set forth. This inadequacy is not simply a matter of academic concern: atheism pushed to its logical conclusion (few carry it so far) leads to personal and social disintegration. In a keen analysis of the inadequacy of Doctor John Dewey's "Common Faith," Doctor Hartshorne writes: "Emotions are conquered, as Spinoza taught us, by other emotions: and it cannot be that any group of intellectuals can impose humanitarian ideals upon average egoistic mankind unless it can point to an object of admiration and devotion emotionally more stirring, not merely than each man is to himself, but also more moving than are the objects of devotion furnished to most men by the groups to which they belong, such as family or nation. Without God as a real individual above man, what can each of us concretely realize as so great and definite that his individual and collective egoisms are humbled in its presence? Humanity? Surely this is too abstract and formless an object to perform any such function. And surely there are none so blind as they who will not see that in fact it does not perform it! And what have recent times shown if not that humanism is a feeble bulwark against the collective egoism of state- and race-worship?" Doctor Hartshorne's controversion of nontheistic humanism is not based upon a restatement of the old supernaturalistic arguments for theism. He draws out what he believes to be the logical implications of scientific naturalism and calls his own theism "naturalistic" theism. "To the older naturalism as well as the older theism these expressions would have appeared self-contradictory, and in terms of the older concepts of nature and God they would have been so. But the new view consists in such a conception of God and such a conception of nature that the two concepts coincide. Theistic naturalism will be subject to attack from two groups, each of which has found its orthodoxy: those who think that no theism is worthy of consideration, and those who are equally scornful of naturalism." But all those who are open-minded and who are deeply concerned with the consequences

of ideas (true and false) in the life of mankind will profit greatly by a restudy of the question of God or no-God with Doctor Hartshorne as guide and mentor.

Professor Dickie is also concerned with the same cosmic skepticism which is Professor Hartshorne's concern, but his argument is definitely theological and biblical, while Professor Hartshorne's is philosophical. *Beyond Humanism* is much more likely to persuade the "atheist" than *Revelation and Response*. The latter may serve to reassure the theist who has begun to weaken under the influence of modern skepticism, but it assumes much which the atheist would challenge. This is the weakness of many books which are written by modern defenders of the faith. Often they comprise lectures to theological students or church groups where there are no stray "atheists" to challenge these assumptions and where the common acceptance of these basic assumptions makes argument concerning them superfluous. This is not to deny the value of Professor Dickie's discussion, for even those who believe in God need clarification and development of their theological ideas. And they are prepared not only to go "beyond humanism," but mayhap "beyond Hartshorne," for Christian faith is not primarily the result of philosophical dialectics. As the title suggests, Professor Dickie is concerned with the question which has been brought anew into focus by certain Continental theologians, namely, "Does God speak to man?" "Has God spoken to us in His Son?" This latter question is a perennial one. Is Jesus God's word to man or is Jesus one with us in our search for God? Professor Dickie does not side with Barth's extreme "either or position." Perhaps he would say rather "both and." In criticism of Barth he declares: "there is a danger of so construing human nature as to make it difficult to understand how an intelligible Word of God can come to creatures who are wholly different from God; how God can reveal Himself where there is no kinship between Himself and the recipient of His revelation." Jesus is "mankind's Supreme Believer" as well as the "incarnate Word." Is religious certainty possible? This is the question with which Professor Dickie deals at length. He is Professor Karl Heim's translator and he believes that Heim rather than Barth gives the right lead to an answer here. The discussion ranges from the skeptical "mood" of today (Krutch) through the crisis theology to the finality of the Christian gospel with wide references to contemporary literature in all chapters.

GORDON POTEAT.

CROSS AND SWASTIKA: The Ordeal of the German Evangelical Church. Arthur Frey. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. 224. $2.50.

THIS is a very direct and clear statement of the ideas, which, born in the past and strengthened in the present, have combined to produce the ordeal through which the German Evangelicals are now passing. The author shows the tendencies existing before the Reformation, which are again showing themselves. He traces the post-reformation thought which also has been a fruitful seed-bed for the prevalent Nazi ideas. To this is added a simple study of the twentieth century myth, as he calls it, of blood, race and soil, which is propagated by Dr. Alfred Rosenberg; an appraisal of the Ludendorff paganism, a summary of the position of the German Christians and a clear statement of the attitude of the Confessional or Evangelical Christians which are the last bulwark of true Christianity in Germany.

It is altogether likely that horror occasioned by Hitler antisemitism has obscured the church conflict which is no less strenuous and fateful in the German

scene. This book by Dr. Arthur Frey, head of the Swiss Evangelical Press Service in Zurich, published in Switzerland in July, 1937, and first translated into English in June, 1938, is deserving of the careful study of every American Christian who would understand the German situation. Indeed there is no guarantee that the same situation may not arise in Great Britain or America. The author's warnings to the church to be the church, though undoubtedly influenced by the Barthian dialectic as appears in Barth's introduction, are pertinent to the church everywhere, surrounded as it is by subtle temptations to shift its base from the Gospel to some other sandy foundation.

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH.

HISTORY AND THE GOSPEL. C. H. Dodd. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. Pp. 189. $2.00.

AFTER a brilliant career at Oxford the author studied theology at Mansfield College and Berlin. Since 1935 he has been Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University, England. During the year 1935 he was the Shaffer Lecturer at Yale and the Ingersoll Lecturer at Harvard. The present volume contains the lectures delivered in 1938 at the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.; Union Theological Seminary, New York; and the Andover-Newton Theological School.

Doctor Dodd deals with the relation of the Christian faith to modern interpretations of history. History is examined from the point of view of the faith of the church. His position may be found in the following quotations: "The return to a theology of transcendence makes a difference. The Bible, and the New Testament in particular, is not any longer to be treated as an historical corpus, revealing tendencies within history in which the immanent working of the divine is to be understood . . . the historical criticism of the Gospels . . . loses its importance for theology. It possesses a scientific interest, like the historical criticism of any other set of ancient documents, but it has no strictly theological interest. The Gospels were not written from historical or even from biographical motives. They were written 'from faith to faith.' . . The older method of criticism, in its search for bare facts set out to eliminate whatever in the Gospels might be attributed to the faith or experience of the church. . . They (authors of the Gospels) did not write to gratify our curiosity about what happened, but to bear witness to the revelation of God. To do full justice to the intention of an author is a necessary step toward understanding his work." The book is well chosen as of special value by the Religious Book Club.

ELMER W. POWELL.

THE SINGING CHURCH. Edmund S. Lorenz. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. 1938. Pp. 297. $1.50.

IT IS safe to say that few men know the field of Christian hymnology more thoroughly than Doctor Lorenz. His study is both comprehensive and learned. He divides it into three major parts: "The Character of the Hymn," the "History and Development of the Christian Hymn," and "Practical Hymnology"; these "parts" gather up respectively six, twelve, and four chapters. Limited space forbids our praise further than this: it is indispensable to the student of hymns and hymnology. The reviewer would like the book better if the author had exorcised his tendency toward trite and over-pious phraseology, and if he had been a great deal more critical of the cheap (and cheapening) gospel song.

W. R. MCNUTT.

This Great Business of Being Christian. Edgar DeWitt Jones. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1938. Pp. 113. $1.25.

Doctor Jones, minister of the Central Woodward Church, Detroit, and president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1936-1938, writes out of much experience, keen understanding, and deep conviction. He is convinced that the superlative need of our time is the birth of a religion able to challenge the total life of man, and claim all his highest loyalties. The cue to this is revealed by key words in the five chapter headings: Great Business, Grand Adventure, Audacious Enterprise, Expanding Horizons, and Eternal Quest. The first of these gives title to the book, the second deals with preaching, the next with prayer, the fourth with Christian unity, and the final with God. And each chapter, in a very high sense, proves rewarding to the reader.

W. R. McNutt.

The Acts of the Apostles in Present-day Preaching. Halford E. Luccock. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 166. $1.00.

In his foreword, the author suggests that this volume might have been called "Notebook on the Acts." This would more accurately represent the character of the book. It is not an exposition of The Acts for preaching purposes nor is it a series of sermon studies based upon The Acts. It is rather a collection of thoughts that came to the writer's mind as he read the New Testament record of the early church. Many of these thoughts are recollections of readings in modern literature brought into focus by some sentence in the text. Often the text serves as a spring-board for a leap of considerable distance from the significance of the text. Some of the notes illustrate expert "spiritualizing." The preacher need not be enslaved by the biblical text. It is his business to relate it to contemporaneous situations, as Doctor Luccock suggests. But the book would be more exemplary in sermon making if it represented a closer concern for the original historical significances. There is a rich array of illustrative material here, but the methods of the author need to be used with considerable caution. This volume covers the first eight chapters only.

Gordon Poteat.

World Community. William Paton. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1939. Pp. 191. $1.50.

Many ministers are concerned with the waning interest of the churches in the cause of foreign missions. There is common a mood of defeatism. Can interest be revived? Hardly along the old lines. A new approach is required based upon a realization of the great changes that have occurred in so-called mission lands. I know of no book better calculated to supply the new facts and their interpretation in terms understandable by average church members than this small book by one of the secretaries of the International Missionary Council. It is not only factual, but its expositions will generate a new enthusiasm for the world mission of the church in relation to the most critical question of our time—international conflict. Mr. Paton writes in the light of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of 1937, and the Madras Conference of 1938. Some of the titles to his chapters will give an idea of the scope of the book: "The Break Up of the Older Community," "What the Church Means," "The Church Universal Exists," "Can Men Be Changed?" "Remaking Society," "The Church and National Life," "The Universal Church and

the World of Nations." I recommend this book whole-heartedly as a basis for a series of sermons planned to create a Christian World Consciousness in the Church.

GORDON POTEAT.

STUDIES IN HYMNOLOGY. Mrs. Crosby Adams. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. 1938. Pp. vii, 96. $1.00.

MRS. ADAMS has succeeded in giving a wealth of information in seven brief chapters. Although the study covers a large scope in a brief space, the author stimulates and inspires one to continue the search. She develops some interesting leads to follow in this search.

A study of this book will start some critical thinking about the hymns used in our Sunday school and church services. With more than 400,000 hymns from which to choose, the need to learn the art of selecting and building an intelligent appreciation for those hymns of lasting value is apparent. The author has given some very definite suggestions as to how this may be done.

EDITH RANDOLPH.

THOSE GAY MIDDLE AGES. Frederick D. Kershner. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 235. $2.00.

SOMEONE has remarked that a reading of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians gives the impression that we are looking down on a first-century Christian meeting-house with the roof off and can see all that is taking place within. This book by Doctor Kershner, Dean of the School of Religion at Butler University, does something on the same order for the Middle Ages. It is as if a well-trained, clever reporter were transported back to medieval times and commissioned to write a series of articles on the salient features of the period. One feels, however, that the reporter's copy would not be as interesting as the dean's, because reporters, as a class, either by policy or inclination are extremely obsequious to the Roman Catholic Church, and no one can write as interestingly about medieval affairs as Doctor Kershner has done "who either begs or fears the favors or the hates" of the Roman Church.

The book is a splendid introduction for those who have taken little interest in the Middle Ages, and its breezy style is bound to make it refreshing even for close students of the period. Questions of sanitation, health, morals, superstition, religion and theology are treated in a limpid fashion and truth is shown to be not only stranger but more interesting than fiction.

In *Those Gay Middle Ages* the Middle Ages prove to be not so gay. On the contrary "Life in the Middle Ages was drab and inconsequential for the majority . . . Pigs were the garbage collectors even in large cities like London." In the chapter, "The Real Thing in Relics," we meet a connoisseur, Cardinal Albrecht, one of the greatest collectors of relics in all times. In his collection at Halle the good cardinal listed *inter alia* "the true body of Christ which he had actually offered for the sins of men," "a bottle of the Virgin Mary's milk" and "a jug of wine from the wedding at Cana." The entire collection was good for 39, 245, 120 years of indulgence.

One finds an age that was filthy, cruel, immoral, overrun with venereal disease and the grossest kind of superstition, relying for salvation on a religion that was wholly benighted, excepting for one bright spot—the art of the period. It is a

sweeping indictment that runs counter to such treatments as Walsh's *The Thirteenth, Greatest of All the Centuries,* but the book is fascinating and carries conviction, and it is not easy to replace the halo around the Middle Ages when once it has been read.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

THE APOCRYPHA, AN AMERICAN TRANSLATION. Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1938. Pp. 493. $3.00.

IT is surprising that this should be the first translation of the Apocrypha into English directly from the Greek. The reason for this tardiness lies, no doubt, in the fact that these Scriptures were so generally regarded as of secondary importance or even of no importance at all by influential Christian groups. The apocryphal Scriptures, however, are worth an up-to-date translation, and we are glad that it is Doctor Goodspeed who has done it, since he has proved himself to be a master in this field.

Anyone who has never taken the trouble to read these books will find that several of them, Ecclesiasticus, for instance, are among the finest of the Wisdom literature of the Hebrews; while others, notably Susanna, compare favorably with Ruth or Esther as religious romance, and First Maccabees is as vital a section of Hebrew history as anything which we have in the canonical Scriptures.

That the Apocrypha will ever take the place in liturgical usage which large sections of it deserve is to be doubted, but at least it has sufficiently close relationship to our canon to make it indispensable.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

MEDIEVAL HANDBOOKS OF PENANCE. John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 478. $4.75.

THIS is a timely volume in a day when psychiatry is rapidly taking over the cure of souls from priestcraft. Undertaking as its chief function the cure of men's souls, the early church soon found that it was necessary to systematize the task and to place at the disposal of its practitioners handbooks that would indicate the symptoms and the treatment of sick souls. Without such manuals it can easily be seen that the whole practice would have fallen into chaos. In consequence the penitential disciplines of the church were codified and made available to her priests who were given, within limits, discretionary powers in their application.

This book by McNeill and Gamer makes available to English readers for the first time the vast body of these penitential disciplines with the instruction and exhortation that went with them. Included in this collection are: Early Irish Penitentials, Early Welsh Penitentials, Penitentials of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Eighth and Ninth Century Frankish and Visigothic Penitentials, Penitentials authorized by Frankish Ecclesiastics and Selections from later Penitentials. Added to this we get pointed citations of penitential elements in medieval public law and synodical decisions relating to the penitentials.

The value of the book does not lie in its critical appraisal of the penitentials but in making them available with enlightening introductions to English readers. It is a source book of the shortcomings of our forebears and the method that their religious leaders employed to make them behave.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

CHILDREN OF LIGHT. In Honor of Rufus M. Jones. Edited by Howard H. Brinton. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. xii, 416. $3.50.

"THE essays in this book have been written by students of Quaker history in honor of Rufus M. Jones. They are presented on his seventy-fifth birthday as an affectionate tribute of gratitude and admiration to one who has contributed more widely than any person now living to knowledge and understanding of the history of the Society of Friends" (p. ix).

There is the intent of the book, and the volume itself carries out that intent perfectly. Biography is represented by chapters on William Penn: "Personality Types of Two Quaker Leaders" (William Penn and John Woolman), including a comparison of these men in Kretschmer's terms of personality types; Edward Byllynge: "Joseph Hewes, the Quaker Signer"; "Sir Thomas Fowell Buston, Bart.," and "Timothy Nicholson, Candle of the Lord."

Bibliographical material includes "William Penn's *Christian Quaker*"; "Hebraica and the Jews in Early Quaker Interest"; "Latin Works of Friends," and "Stages in Spiritual Development as Exemplified in Quaker Journals."

History and Sociology contribute "The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland"; "New England Quakers and Military Service in the American Revolution"; "Quakerism and Home Life: An Eighteenth Century Study," and "The Quaker Contribution to the Old Northwest."

The book is of special value to students of the Friends' Movement and—what Rufus Jones himself would most approve—a direct answer to those who believe that the Children of Light are engaged only in a mystic contemplation of its brilliance. Here they "convince" us that it is the illumination and guide of their "way."

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON.

THE REBIRTH OF VENKATA REDDI. Pearl Dorr Longley. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1938. Pp. xii, 349. $2.50.

THIS is an interesting story of caste and creed in the Telugu section of South India. The author deals with practices of worship in the villages. The practices vary and one village may observe some rites which are unknown a few miles away. Caste distinctions and customs may vary, but the basic principles are the same wherever Hinduism is practised. Outcastes or pariahs are servants and slaves of caste people. Reckoned as Hindus, they have not the privileges of Hinduism, such as entering temples.

The author describes the family and social life under the intolerable burden of caste in the India of today. The position of women, child marriage, Mahatma Gandhi and religious barriers are described. The tortures of Venkata Reddi and his son Rajanna, in seeking freedom against the power of cruel bondage to the past that women have to bear, give the book a poignant, almost desperate tone, but free from callous pessimism or overdrawn realism.

ELMER W. POWELL.

FRIEDRICH PAULSEN. An Autobiography. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 514. $3.75.

THIS is a beautiful example of typographical art made possible by the endowment of Columbia University. Doctor Paulsen, German educator and philosopher, died in 1908. He was considered a "dangerous radical," and if alive today he would

probably align himself with liberal and independent thinkers such as Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann who have been exiled by the Third Reich.

In these memoirs is a full account of his private and professional life beginning on his father's farm, continuing through his education and university career. He sought to reform the German educational system in defiance of Kaiser Wilhelm II. From 1860 to 1900 the University of Berlin reached a height of intellectual distinction which no other institution of higher learning has ever attained and which, unless all signs fail, will not soon be again attained. The great group of scholars, among whom Paulsen was a younger member, included von Ranke, Mommsen, Harms, Wagner, Helmholtz, Dorner, Pfleiderer and Bernhard Weiss. Such educators as Nicholas Murray Butler and Abraham Flexner have acknowledged the debt of the civilized world to Paulsen as educator and philosopher.

ELMER W. POWELL.

TUDOR PURITANISM. M. M. Knappen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1939. Pp. 555. $4.00.

DOCTOR KNAPPEN is Assistant Professor of English History in the University of Chicago. The book in type, paper, printing and binding is a work of art. The expense was assumed by the University.

Puritanism was a transitional movement linking the medieval with the modern. Puritan asceticism is directly related to Roman Catholic asceticism; Puritan economic doctrine to the social teaching of the scholastics. The English Puritan movement was concerned with matters more basic than questions of ceremony, costume and church government. These are symptomatic of basic issues: the rôle of idealistic forces in the Post-Reformation society and the seriousness with which their principles should be followed.

Most writers begin with the obvious signs of disagreement between Puritans and Anglicans. This book traces the movement from its beginnings—when William Tyndale left London (without the consent of the king) to prepare a translation of the Bible (without the consent of the bishop), but self-dedicated to passive opposition. It is this passive resistance doctrine that distinguishes the Tudor Puritan from the Stuart Puritan who was willing to take the sword against his rulers.

ELMER W. POWELL.

AND YE VISITED ME. Russell L. Dicks. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1939. Pp. 256. $2.50.

PREVIOUS to this volume the author has given us *Meditations for the Sick,* and in collaboration with Dr. Richard C. Cabot, *When You Call on the Sick.* This present volume makes us the more indebted to one who knows a great deal about sick people and how to minister to them. He writes as a member of that advance guard of physicians and ministers who are laying hold upon the science of psychology and psychiatry, as well as the science of medicine, in order the better to help those sick in body and mind.

And Ye Visited Me is unique in its set-up, and is doubly valuable by virtue of its concern with clinical material. This latter is composed of the records of interviews by clergymen who came into the hospital as visitors, or by those younger ministers taking clinical training therein. In the first half of the book these records

are printed in a column parallel with a second, composed of many questions, by our author, on the interviews. In the latter portion the same scheme prevails except that Doctor Dicks, in column two, makes comments upon the clinical materials rather than merely asking questions. For this reason we find the second part the more valuable for us who are only "laymen" in the field. Even so it is a most rewarding and illuminating book for one willing to give careful study to the materials presented. Thoroughly digested, this volume is sure to make our visitations to the sick more purposeful and more helpful.

W. R. McNutt.

American Caste and the Negro College. Buell G. Gallagher, with a "Foreword" by William H. Kilpatrick. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 463. $2.50.

It is not an exaggeration to say that *American Caste and the Negro College* by Buell G. Gallagher, President of Talladega College, is not only the book of the year, but also the book of this decade on the so-called "race problem" in America. The book aims to provide a basis for an understanding of the nature of the social forces which control the society in which the Negro college functions, and suggestions as to how these forces may be channeled in new directions. Two major contentions of the author are that (1) the key for the treatment of the too long "prattle about the race problem" is to make caste irrelevant; and that (2) the Negro college can be an effective tool in the effort to understand the nature of the social forces which control Christian and democratic America, and to channel these forces in new directions.

There are three main divisions of this book. The first eight chapters analyze caste and the social forces which work through the caste system. Chapter nine and ten analyze the educational structure in the light of the social task of the Negro college. The remaining chapters, eleven through fourteen, work out details of principle and practice for the college which seeks to discharge its social function.

The author gives in this volume an interpretation of the American caste system. With striking clarity he enables the reader to see through the workings of prejudice in its many ramifications to the underlying motives which form the groundwork of the American caste system. The strangle-hold which the system has on the segregated Negro college is real, not theoretical. The dilemma of both whites and Negroes provides material for thought and action rarely discussed objectively but with disinterested sympathy for both groups caught in the horns of the race-dilemma. The book is prophetic in its vision and depth. It is a masterpiece of scholarship in the field. It is written in a lucid style and is engrossing even to the reader who has lived through most of the experiences on either side of the barrier of caste.

The book does not aim to present any panacea, but it does offer a program that "all men of good-will can study to advantage." The author "hews to the line and lets the chips fall where they may." As pointed out in the Foreword, the author has brought to Dr. William H. Kilpatrick a clearer view than ever he had before of what the problem now means. This reviewer recommends the reading of this book by all Americans who desire an intelligent understanding of those forces in our society which inhibit the operation of the Christian and democratic spirit. In the final analysis, the "detours and dead ends in Negro education" present dilemmas which whites and Negroes must face. These dilemmas are inherent in

the American caste system. This reviewer rejoices that there is one white President of a Negro college who has not only the vision to see the absurdities of caste in America, but also the courage to write a monumental volume on American caste and still live in Alabama.

JOHN DILLINGHAM.

PASTORAL PSYCHIATRY. John Sutherland Bonnell. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1938. Pp. xii, 237. $2.50.

Pastoral Psychiatry is a trail-blazing book in the field of personal counseling for the minister. Doctor Bonnell points out that the physician, the psychologist and the psychiatrist have made available valuable information concerning principles of physical and mental development which is indispensable in helping people with their personal problems. But he believes the minister has a unique contribution to make in helping people who are in difficulty, whether the basis of the trouble is physical, mental or moral. He makes it clear that the minister's work is to help people find God and the spiritual resources which flow from him.

In the opening chapter, Doctor Bonnell relates his impressions and experiences when as a boy he was taken by his father, a member of the staff of a mental hospital, on visits to the patients. From observing his father he learned the importance of a sympathetic, understanding approach to people; and came to see the value of spiritual resources in strengthening and giving insight to the distressed. Following this he tells about his work as an attendant in this same hospital, in which he describes many characteristics and symptoms of mental illness. He looks upon these experiences as a most helpful preparation for the ministry.

After the first two chapters the book has to do with the author's own counseling experiences as he faces with men, women, and children a great variety of problems, including fears of all kinds, inferiority feelings, sex problems, feelings of guilt and parent-child misunderstandings and difficulties. One is impressed by the author's sympathy, his ability to lead people to an understanding of their difficulties through knowledge of principles governing mental and spiritual development, as well as a rare aptitude for applying Scripture in a way to illustrate and clarify, and give spiritual resources for meeting the problem at hand. Prayer and meditation also serve as an effective means of helping. Doctor Bonnell recognizes his limitations, and the need for cooperation and help from physician and psychiatrist who have specialized training which the minister does not have.

Pastoral Psychiatry, through its wealth of actual situations and problems, which are analyzed and worked out with admirable skill, is a helpful guide to the minister in personal counseling.

LEON R. ROBISON, JR.

CHRISTIANS IN AN UNCHRISTIAN SOCIETY. Ernest Fremont Tittle. *Hazen Books on Religion.* New York: Association Press. 1939. Pp. vii, 62. 50 cents.

DOCTOR TITTLE presents us with another notable volume in the Hazen series on religion. Facing the problem of the Christian living in an unchristian society, he centers his thought in four stimulating chapters: God in History; The Kingdom of God; The Christian Revolution; Christians and the World.

Christians have no unified view concerning the relation of God to the world, although all Christians believe God is somewhat related to the process of history.

Some think God is concerned only with saving a few individuals from the world. Others believe men can do nothing to redeem society, but that God in his own good time will do so. Both of these views end in social apathy and despair. What Christians need today is the view that God seeks the redemption both of individuals and society through the aid of Christian men and women.

While the kingdom of God can never be realized fully among men because of our human limitations, yet as Christians we are bound to work with God for a vastly better world in which a fuller salvation will be possible for individuals and society alike.

The Christian revolution is not one of force and violence. To these, and to the futility of modern warfare, the Christian spirit is irrevocably opposed. The Christian revolution is one based upon lowly service which hopes to create a brotherhood of men bringing richer life to all.

This short volume should be widely read. It furnishes an excellent basis for discussion, particularly in young people's groups.

GEORGE W. DAVIS.

CHRIST AND THE HINDU HEART: An Exposition of the First Epistle of John. J. E. Graefe, Th.D., Dean, Theological Department, Andhra Christian College, Guntur, India. New York: Revell and Co. 1938. Pp. 155. $1.50.

THIS volume is written primarily to allay doubt and suspicion concerning the nature and purpose of Christianity in the minds of those Indians outside the Christian Indian Fellowship. In addition to this purpose, for Western readers a synopsis of Hindu thought, particularly that of the *Gita,* is found in an elaborate introduction extending through pages 11-48.

The main body of the book constitutes an effort to reveal the essential and distinctive aspects of Christianity through an exposition of the First Epistle of John. The nature of religious knowledge, the Christian's relation to God and the world, Christian intolerance, the second birth, fellowship with ultimate reality, God's suffering love, faith, and grace are all presented through the material in the epistle. This single book of the Bible is employed because the author is convinced from long experience that it presents the best approach to those whose religious background is pantheistic in character.

This volume constitutes an interesting object-lesson to the Westerner as to how "the gospel must be preached" to the Indian mind. It is not such a simple matter as just preaching. The successful presentation demands a thorough comprehension of the thought forms and religious moods of the people to whom the gospel is presented.

The author is sympathetic to India and the best in her traditions. He does not desire to proselyte, but to make Christianity a force for the enrichment of Hindu life. His tolerant attitude is revealed in the following observation with which I close the review of this unusual book:

> "Many Christians are hoping that India, with its beautiful and wonderful family-system, will help the world to solve it (the problem of maintaining a family relationship to God and to one another). Certainly all men, and all Christians, would be much better if they would feel the responsibility for each other that the members of an Indian family do, and be willing to sacrifice for each other as do the members of an Indian family."

GEORGE W. DAVIS.

FEAR AND RELIGION. Aloysius Roche. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons. 1938. Pp. 128. $1.35.

THIS short volume by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church seeks to impart a sense of security to those who are haunted by the fears which terrorize men as they experience this present life and contemplate the life to come.

The author finds the ultimate cure of fear in the nature of God as divine Father who does not desire the destruction of any of his children. Hell is a reality not because God desires it to be, but because men, by their lack of love and their own evil, render such an estate imperative. For the righteous, however, fear of such a fate is eliminated by their trust in the Christlike character of God.

This volume is especially interesting to Protestants for its portrayal, from the Catholic view-point, of man's fear of the Church, of death, of purgatory, and of hell.

GEORGE W. DAVIS.

BOOK NOTICES

—Yet We Can Hope. Lee A. Howe, Jr. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1938. Pp. 156. $1.25.

The book consists of twelve chapters—twelve sermons we suspect—which attack the problem that confronts the thoughtful Christian of today relative to belief in God. The author says, Yes we can believe in God and trust him, and these are the reasons why I so think. He writes well, and his book should have a very wide reading among our church people. W. R. McNutt.

Vesper Dramas. Marcus Bach. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 197. $2.50.

Here are the complete texts of ten dramas suitable for use in the churches. Accompanying each of the ten is a Worship Program into which the particular drama fits as an integral part. An introductory paragraph gives the purchaser of the book full rights of using these productions, royalty free. The ten dramas are: "Craftsman of Galilee," "Above These Voices," "Resurrection," "The Window," "The Coming Light," "The Widow's Mite," "Thin Ice," "The Curse O' God," "Mother Owen Keeps Christmas," and "Days to Come." All the dramas are by Mr. Bach, and they have a fine quality of "contemporariness." W. R. McNutt.

Biblical Backgrounds. J. McKee Adams. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1938. Pp. 517. $3.75.

This volume is "A Geographical Survey of Biblical Lands in the Light of the Scriptures and Recent Research." Doctor Adams, sometime student in Crozer Theological Seminary, is Professor of Biblical Introduction in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The Bible "is an oriental book from an oriental environment, and to the East we must go to get its meaning." Does this go beyond geographical studies? The volume contains 25 maps and 100 photographs. A mass of information is packed between the covers. It is a geographical dictionary fully documented. "*The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* by Principal Sir George Adam Smith," says Doctor Adams "has been my constant companion in travels and sojourns in the Near East." It is an excellent, readable book of reference.

Elmer W. Powell.

The Book of a Thousand Tongues. Eric M. North. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1938. Pp. 386. $2.50.

This beautiful book is a record of a marvelous achievement in World Christianity, the translation of the Scriptures into more than a thousand languages and dialects in all parts of the earth. The story of this achievement is illustrated by examples of the various languages in facsimile texts. Church school libraries by all means ought to have a copy on exhibition. It is a fascinating story. Gordon Poteat.

A Handbook of Drama. Frank Hurburt O'Hara and Marguerite Harmon Bro. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 257. $2.00.

An excellent volume for the classroom study of the drama, or for the use of those who aspire to create dramas. The structure of the book follows: Part One—

"Drama: Essentials and Types"; Part Two—"The Play Itself: Structure and Technique"; Part Three—"The Story of the Drama"; Part Four—"Dictionary of Terms and Indexes."

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

INTAGLIOS. Jane Elizabeth Conway. Boston. The Christopher Publishing House. 1938. Pp. 161. $1.75.

EIGHT adaptations of literary stories and incidents. They require extensive pageantry and scenery, considerable music and usually large casts. The material is theatric rather than dramatic and suffers from an overeager use of the episode form.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON.

IN THAT CASE. Edited by Murray H. Leiffer. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. 1938. Pp. 156. $2.00.

DOCTOR LEIFFER, professor of sociology and social ethics in Garrett Biblical Institute, asked several hundred ministers to submit a list of their most perplexing problem-questions. Fifty problems were selected and each was answered by two of the ten men selected to solve the difficulties. One question concerns a retired minister who attends the meetings of the youth of the church and takes all the time. Another concerns the former pastor, ten miles away, who returns to conduct funerals, weddings, et cetera. The book will be interesting to those who have parish problems if the other forty-eight questions portray his parish grievance.

ELMER W. POWELL.

MEET THE MAN YOU WERE BORN TO LOVE. J. H. Larson. New York: Fortuny's. 1938. Pp. 196. $2.00.

THIS is a literary arrangement of the Four Gospels printed most attractively without chapters and verses. Many of the old familiar words are translated into contemporary English.

ELMER W. POWELL.

LUNACY BECOMES US. Adolf Hitler and his associates (Edited by Clara Leiser). New York: Liveright. 1939. Pp. x, 138. $1.25.

THE title of this book is taken from a statement credited to General Goering, "If what we have done here is lunacy, then lunacy becomes us." This anthology of Nazi boners is a classic of its kind. Those who cannot distinguish between straight and crooked thinking should read it; those who can probably will.

R. D. MILLER.

OUTLINE STUDIES IN LUKE. John L. Hill. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1937. Pp. 182. $2.00.

THE author is book editor of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, and, as a layman, has been a teacher of the Bible for many years. The purpose of the book is to "bring out clearly the meaning of the text and to apply it to the needs of every-day living." Each chapter begins with a careful outline of the passage considered, with verse notations, which make it easy to use along with the Scripture references. At the close of each of these outlines are suggestions for further thought and discussion.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

DID CHRIST REALLY LIVE? H. G. Wood. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1938. Pp. 192. $1.75.

A WINNING WITNESS. G. S. Dobbins. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1938. Pp. 147. 60 cents.

THE BASIS OF ISRAELITE MARRIAGE. Millar Burrows. New Haven: American Oriental Society. 1938. Pp. viii, 72.

LAFAYETTE. W. E. Woodward. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1938. Pp. 472. $3.50.

THE SUGAR ECONOMY OF PUERTO RICO. Arthur D. Gayer. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. xviii, 326. $3.75.

NEW YORK: AN AMERICAN CITY. Sidney Y. Pomerantz. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 531. $5.00.

CONTEMPORARY MONETARY THEORY. Raymond J. Saulnier. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 420. $4.00.

LABOR LEGISLATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA. Esther Bloss. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. 210. $3.00.

THE HOLY AND THE PROFANE STATE. Thomas Fuller. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Vol. 1, pp. xv, 338; Vol. 2, pp. viii, 441. $7.00.

TYPES OF RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY. Edwin A. Burrt. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1938. Pp. 512. $3.00.

SPIRITUAL POTENCIES. Frank S. Tolman and Mary W. Tolman. New York: Fortuny's. 1938. Pp. 151. $2.00.

THE PHARISEES: THE SOCIOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THEIR FAITH. Louis Finkelstein. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1938. Pp. 793 (2 vols.).

BIOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF. W. Osborne Greenwood. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1939. Pp. 192. $1.75.

HUMANISM AND IMAGINATION. G. R. Elliott. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

RADIANT REALITIES. David M. Gardner. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1938. Pp. 123. $1.00.

HIGHWAYS AND HEDGES. William Wistar Hamilton. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1938. Pp. 119. $1.00.

ST. PAUL. Arthur Darby Nock. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1939. Pp. 256. $2.00.

HEROES OF THOUGHT. John Middleton Murry. New York: Julian Messner. 1938. Pp. 364. $3.75.

STUDIES IN METAPHYSICAL POETRY. Theodore Spencer and Mark Van Doren. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. iv, 88. $1.50.

PROGRAM BOOK 1938-39: VOL. II. New Friends of Music. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. x, 46. 25 cents.

RAINBOW THOUGHTS. C. Adele Van Wickle. Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1938. Pp. 210. $1.50.

ANTHONY PHILIP HEINRICH. William Treat Upton. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv, 337. $4.50.

EVANGELISM FOR THE WORLD TODAY. John R. Mott. New York: Harper and Brothers.

RETHINKING RELIGION. John Haynes Holmes. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1939.

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF TIBETAN LAMAISM. Antoinette K. Gordon. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xxxi, 129. $16.00.

CHRIST OR CÆSAR. Hugh Black. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1938. Pp. xi, 209. $2.00.

THINKING WITH THE LORD. Compiled by Dumont Clarke. New York: Paul M. Hinkhouse. 1939. Pp. 30. 20 cents.

MY DRIFT INTO RURAL SOCIOLOGY. Charles Josiah Galpin. University (La.): Louisiana State University Press. 1938. Pp. xi, 151. $1.00.

THE ART OF COUNSELING. Rollo May. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. 1939. Pp. 247. $2.00.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. I. H. Rubenstein. Chicago: Crandon Press. 1935. Pp. 33.

THE HISTORY OF HISTORY. James T. Shotwell. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xii, 407. $3.75.

PLATO TODAY. R. H. S. Crossman. New York: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. viii, 311. $2.50.

UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN. Lewis Joseph Sherrill. New York: Abingdon Press. 1939. Pp. 218. $1.25.

THE GROWTH OF LINCOLN'S FAITH. Harlan Hoyt Horner. New York: Abingdon Press. 1939. Pp. 176. $1.50.

JESUS AND THE EDUCATIONAL METHOD. Luther A. Weigle. New York: Abingdon Press. 1939. Pp. 128. $1.00.

ITALY AND THE VATICAN AT WAR. S. William Halperin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1938. Pp. xvii, 483. $3.00.

RICHARD UPJOHN, ARCHITECT AND CHURCHMAN. Everard M. Upjohn. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xviii, 243, 109 illustrations. $4.00.

POEMS. John M. Dobie. Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1939. Pp. 79. $1.50.

ESSENTIAL CHRISTIANITY. Samuel Angus. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1939. Pp. xxv, 226. $2.00.

THE CLUE TO HISTORY. John Macmurray. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1939. Pp. xii, 243. $2.50.

FORM CRITICISM. E. Basil Redlich. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1939. Pp. 209. $2.25.

TO SAVE THEIR SOULS. Bessie Lewis. Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1939. Pp. 303. $2.50.

THE CREED OF A SLAVE. R. J. Williams. Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1939. Pp. x, 79. $1.50.

EMILE DURKHEIM AND HIS SOCIOLOGY. Harry Alpert. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. 233. $2.50.

JUSTA EDOVARDO KING. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv, 71. $1.60.

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS OF TRINITY COLLEGE, 1887–1894. John Franklin Crowell. Durham (N. C.): Duke University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv, 280. $3.00.

THE COQUETTE. Hannah Webster Foster. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xix, 261. $2.60.